

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 634

CE 024 853

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
 TITLE Refining the Career Education Concept. Part IV. Monographs on Career Education.
 INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE Sep 79
 NOTE 56p.; For related documents see ED 132 427, ED 146 362, and ED 164 860.
 AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Community Colleges; Community Involvement; Concept Formation; *Cooperative Planning; *Educational Development; Educational Legislation; *Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Persons; Guidance; *Liberal Arts; Program Implementation
 IDENTIFIERS *Career Education Incentive Act; *Youth Employment Training Program

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents the fourth annual summary of "Refining the Concept of Career Education" attempts. The seven papers included are intended to provide readers with an historical record of career education in 1979. The first paper, "Lessons Learned from Participants in the 15 YETP/Career Education Mini-Conferences," represents some of the Office of Career Education's efforts to develop and encourage closer and more productive relationships between the Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) and the Career Education Incentive Act. The second paper, "Liberal Arts and Career Education Revisited," points out that career education and liberal arts education are not natural enemies. In the third paper, "Contrasts between the Guidance and Career Education Movements," similarities between these two fields are discussed as well as possible avenues of further development available to both. Career education as a community effort is discussed in the fourth paper, "School Volunteers and Career Education: Some Conceptual Thoughts." In the fifth paper, "Career Education for Exceptional Individuals: Challenges for the Future," the Office of Career Education reinforces its commitment to exceptional individuals. The last two papers illustrate what might have been had congressional appropriations been made at their authorized levels. These two papers are titled "Community Colleges and the Career Education Incentive Act" and "Strategy Considerations for Implementing the K-12 Portion of the Career Education Incentive Act." (BM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

EUI86634

CE 024 853

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

REFINING THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT

PART IV

by
Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

September 1979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Patricia Harris, *Secretary*

Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

William L. Smith, *Commissioner*

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1979**

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction.....	1
Lessons Learned From Participants In the 15 YETP/Career Education Mini-Conferences.....	3
Liberal Arts Education and Career Education Revisited.....	11
Contrasts Between the Guidance and the Career Education Movements..	18
School Volunteers and Career Education: Some Conceptual Thoughts ..	25
Career Education for Exceptional Individuals: Challenges for the Future..	31
Community Colleges and the Career Education Incentive Act.....	39
Strategy Considerations for Implementing the K-12 Portion of the Career Education Incentive Act.....	47

Introduction

Career education is an *evolving* concept. Each year sees refinements in this concept that touch on a number of levels within Education. The variety of career education problems represented in major speeches serves as a rough barometer both of the nature and the direction of change. The purpose of this monograph is to provide interested readers with some insights into the kinds of contributions OE's Office of Career Education has sought to make in conceptual refinements of career education over the last twelve months. As the fourth in what has become an annual summary of "Refining the Concept of Career Education" attempts, it is hoped that the papers in this series will, individually and collectively, serve the "barometer" function for 1979.

The "LESSONS LEARNED" paper represents only the "tip of the iceberg" with respect to OCE efforts, during 1978-79, to develop and encourage closer and more productive relationships between the Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) of CETA and the Career Education Incentive Act. Its contents will, it is hoped, motivate some readers to look into this problem more closely. Certainly, it represents one of the greatest—and most dangerous—challenges facing the career education movement. It is still far too early to predict the eventual outcome.

Those who find themselves interested in the LIBERAL ARTS AND CAREER EDUCATION REVISITED paper are urged to study other writings on this general topic previously published by OE's Office of Career Education. Several of these can be found in a 1978 OE publication entitled *Considerations of Career Education For Postsecondary Education*. The overriding point being addressed is that "career education" and "liberal arts education" are *not* natural "enemies." On the contrary, each has many positive contributions to make to the other.

One of the most serious papers I prepared during 1979 was entitled CONTRASTS BETWEEN THE GUIDANCE AND CAREER EDUCATION MOVEMENTS. The paper, in effect, attempts to recognize and deal with the old adage that says "Those who fail to learn the lessons of History will suffer the fates of History." As a person who, prior to entering the career education area, spent almost 30 years in the guidance field, it seems to me there are remarkable similarities in both the nature of these two fields and in possible avenues of further development available to both. Because I am convinced that the guidance field—partly, I must admit, through my efforts—has made some serious errors over the last 30 years, I tried in this paper to point out some of these errors in hopes that career education will not repeat them. In part, this paper is intended to provide some stimulus for changing directions within the guidance profession itself. Hopefully, both of these aspirations will be clear to readers of this paper.

Much of the future for career education will be dependent on its success in having career education pictured as a *community* effort, not as something our

Education system does by itself. If this is to occur, a new concept of "school volunteers" must emerge—a concept that views school volunteers, in part, as persons possessing needed skills and expertise not typically found within professional educators. The bedrock parameters of this concept, along with some illustrative examples of how it might operate, are found in the paper entitled **SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS AND CAREER EDUCATION: SOME CONCEPTUAL THOUGHTS**. When this paper was delivered at the 1979 National Convention of the **NATIONAL SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS PROGRAM**, it seemed to meet with considerable receptivity. I am anxious for others to examine and react to the concepts of "volunteerism" found in this paper.

A major milestone for career education was reached in 1979 when the Division of Career Development, Council for Exceptional Children, sponsored a National convention on "Career Education for Exceptional Individuals." The paper in this monograph bearing a similar title was presented near the close of that conference. There are two primary reasons why I wanted to include it here. First, OE's Office of Career Education is deeply committed to providing sound career education to ALL persons—including ALL exceptional individuals. Let there be no mistake about the seriousness of that commitment. Second, I hope that some who read this paper will be motivated to locate and study the series of excellent papers on this general topic found in the proceedings of CEC's National Conference. Sound career education for exceptional individuals is a challenge which can—and must—be met.

Finally, I have chosen to include two papers—one entitled **COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT** and the other entitled **STRATEGY CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE K-12 PORTION OF THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT**—primarily for the historical record. The validity of content found in both papers has been seriously reduced by virtue of recent appropriations actions taken by the United States Congress. Both papers were written, not because such congressional actions were unexpected, but rather simply to illustrate what might have been had congressional appropriations been made at their authorized levels. I do not consider either paper to be a "waste." On the contrary, each has a value, it seems to me, as a means of helping us face the realities of the moment without losing our perspective regarding the desirability of a broader set of goals.

In summary, it is my hope that this set of papers will provide readers with some "taste of the times" for career education in 1979. At the very least, they should provide some kind of historical record. Hopefully, some readers will find them more helpful than that.

Lessons Learned from Participants in the 15 YETP/Career Education Mini-Conferences

At first blush, to make a speech at the end of a solution-oriented working conference such as this makes about as much sense as watering one's lawn immediately after a heavy rain. Further reflection, however, might lead one to conclude that there is some possible point in considering some broad generalizations growing out of the specific issues, problems, and concerns that have been under discussion. I want to attempt to state here the broad-brush generalizations that I gained from conducting the 15 mini-conferences from which this conference program has been generated. I think they have serious implications for the "Where Do We Go From Here?" Question each of us hopefully now faces.

These remarks are divided into three parts. First, I want to present some general observations regarding the construction and operation of LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements that the 135 participants in these 15 mini-conferences convinced me represent the truth. Second, I want to commit briefly on what now seems to me the major problems still to be solved in bringing a quality emphasis to LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements on a national basis. Finally, I want to conclude by summarizing what, to me, now represent major challenges for change facing both LEAs and CETA Prime Sponsors in their attempts to work better together.

While I want to gratefully acknowledge the tremendous helpfulness of each mini-conference participant in supplying me with input for these generalizations, I want simultaneously to absolve each from any direct accountability for what I say. If I failed to listen as well as I should, the fault is mine, not theirs.

LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements Under YETP; General Observations

This presentation properly begins with a series of optimistic observations provided me by the actions of these mini-conference participants. I give them to you here under an assumption that an observation doesn't necessarily have to represent a deep sense of wisdom in order to be considered important. Operational wisdom is fully as important as philosophical wisdom, it seems to me.

First, I am more convinced than ever that listening to the issues, problems, and concerns of practitioners is the best of all possible bases for revising and refining national policies—including laws, rules, and regulations. Practitioners are the real experts in discovering the loopholes, the inconsistencies, and the weaknesses of the laws they are charged with implementing. If this project accomplishes nothing more, it will have been worthwhile, in my opinion, if it serves to illustrate to Federal policymakers the importance—and the essentiality—of listening to and learning from practitioners. Nothing could be more important.

Second, these mini-conferences have convinced me that, if a problem can be identified, practitioners exist somewhere who are finding innovative and creative ways of solving it. Of the 514 issues raised by these mini-conference participants, I found none that they could not discuss constructively from a solution standpoint. *Someone* could always be found who had found a way of dealing constructively with the problem expressed. Invariably, when the participants "brainstormed" a problem, they came up with a number of additional solutions that could be effectively applied. As of now, I no longer believe there are any problems with respect to LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements that defy workable solutions satisfactorily to all parties concerned. This includes problems related to the Fiscal Year Differences, to the "red tape" problem, to problems of academic credit, and to any others that could be named.

Third, I am now convinced that the "communication problem," mentioned so frequently in these mini-conferences, is one of the easiest to solve. All that is involved is a willingness, on the part of persons representing both the LEA and the Prime Sponsor, to take the time necessary to listen and learn from each other. I know this is true because we illustrated it in each of these 15 mini-conferences. True, some words—such as "OJT," "work experience," and "academic credit" didn't initially mean the same thing to LEA persons as they meant to Prime Sponsor representatives, but that proved to be no major problem. When both are willing to learn together from each other, the communication problem disappears. The key ingredients involved are trust, respect, and time. Each of us had the power to make these ingredients available.

Fourth, I am firmly convinced that the innovative, creative thinkers needed to make for successful implementation of LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements at the local community level don't all live in urban areas. We have much to learn from those in rural America where bureaucratic constraints don't exist to stifle creativity. I would defy anyone to find a more innovative way to concentrate a YETP effort on economically disadvantaged youth and still meet the school board's requirement that YETP benefit all students than did Laddie Livingston in rural Delta County, Colorado. Similarly, I would compare the "career employment experiences" of Linda Phelps in Russel County, Kentucky with any other I have seen in terms of the exemplary way it meets both the letter and the spirit of the YETP legislation. We would all do better if we listened more to those from both rural and urban America.

Fifth, I am now convinced that there exists no basic incompatibility between CETA's expressed concern for the economically disadvantaged and the professional educator's concern for all youth. Our mini-conference participants provided me with examples of ways in which special provisions aimed at providing career information for economically disadvantaged could also be made available, at minimum cost to the LEA, for all secondary school age youth. Further, as they discussed problems concerned in helping provide adequate career development assistance for economically disadvantaged youth, it was obvious that this same knowledge could well be used by LEAs in their attempts to provide more effective career development services for all youth. Beyond this, the

number of LEAs taking advantage of the special YETP provisions allowing up to 10 percent of YETP funds to be spent in efforts for all youth regardless of socioeconomic conditions and the even far greater number taking advantage of YETP provisions that allow limited "transition services" for all youth also made it clear that there should be no incompatibility on this point between Prime Sponsors and local school districts.

Finally, I have learned from these mini-conference participants that there appears to be no discernible differences between local school district persons and persons representing Prime Sponsors in terms of their concerns for serving youth's need for employability skills. The obvious conflicts that arise between an emphasis on "employment" versus "employability," in other kinds of Prime Sponsor/LEA relationships does not seem to be present when YETP is considered. While obvious problems still exist in terms of DOL reporting requirements, these problems do not appear to extend to working relationships between Prime Sponsor representatives and local educators with respect to YETP. Both seem generally to agree that the prime and over-riding purpose of YETP lies in the domain of providing youth with general employability skills that will enable them to become productive participants in the occupational society.

With this set of generally optimistic observations, let me now turn to what appears to me to represent the greatest problems yet remaining with respect to YETP.

Problems Yet To Be Resolved in YETP Implementation Efforts

I emphasized earlier that no YETP problems exist which are not now being solved, to some extent, in actual practice. Keeping this generalization in mind, it now seems appropriate to discuss briefly three of the major problems which, while solved in some communities, are yet to be fully comprehended—let alone solved—in many others.

The first problem centers around the special provisions found in YETP with respect to the work experience aspect of "career employment experiences" for in-school youth. Section 680.7 (local educational agency agreements), Part (D) of the CETA rules and regulations under Title IV, Part A require, among "additional provisions," the following:

- "(1) Assurances that participating youth will be provided *constructive* work experience, which will improve their ability to make career decisions and which will provide them with basic work skills needed for regular employment or self-employment"; (italics added)
- "(3) Assurances that jobs provided under this program will be certified by the participating educational agency or institution as relevant to the educational and career goals of the participating youth"
- "(5) An assurance that career employment experience opportunities provided will be certified by a school-based counselor as being relevant

to the career and educational program for the youth being provided those opportunities."

There appears to be no great problem for those YETP youth who are enrolled in a secondary school Vocational Education program. The work experience portion of "career employment experiences," for such youth, seems typically to be tied to the work-study portion of the LEA's Vocational Education offerings. So long as it is in the same area as the general occupational field for which the student is preparing, all three of these special assurances can be met with little difficulty.

The problem appears when one recognizes that not nearly all YETP eligible youth are enrolled—or want to enroll—in Vocational Education. Further, many of these youth, prior to their YETP participation, have made no clear career choices. Our mini-conference participants reported to us that they have discovered many YETP eligible youth who, while severely economically disadvantaged, are intellectually gifted and talented. While they have made no clear career decisions, they are persons for whom college and university education should represent a viable option.

For students not enrolled in Vocational Education, then, it seems obvious that the work experience portion of their "career employment experience" must be carried out within the framework of career exploration—not the further acquisition of entry level vocational skills. The selection of work sites, the nature of work site supervision, and the necessity for rotating work sites so as to maximize career exploration opportunities, all represent crucial problems to be solved in meeting these special YETP assurances for youth not enrolled in Vocational Education.

Some LEAs appear to be "solving" this problem through limiting YETP career employment experiences only to economically disadvantaged youth enrolled in Vocational Education programs. Eligibility for participation in YETP has been determined by the Congress based on economic factors, not on which curriculum the youth has chosen in the secondary school. Much remains to be done in order for this requirement to be fully met. Solutions are readily available. They need to be utilized.

The second problem that became apparent during the mini-conferences is that there is no sensible or logical way LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements centered around YETP can be divorced from other desirable kinds of LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships. Our mini-conference participants, time after time, found they could discuss YETP only in relation to Title II of CETA, in relation to the Summer Youth Employment Program, in relation to the Private Industry Councils of CETA's Title VII, and in relation to the Governor's discretionary funds for CETA. While the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements called for in CETA's Title IV, Subpart A, pertain only to YETP, there seems to be an obvious need for such agreements to be extended beyond this. Again, this is a problem which, while being solved now in some communities, has not, by and large, yet been even recognized in many places. In retrospect, I can see this as one of the major mistakes I made in setting up these mini-conferences. Thanks to the participants, we were able to correct this mistake to some extent.

The third problem is that of better coordinating YETP activities of Community Based Organizations (CBOs)—including both those involving in-school youth and those involving out-of-school youth—with those activities included in the YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement. The need for greater interaction among representatives of Prime Sponsors, of CBOs, and of LEAs in discussing issues, problems, and concerns related to both short range and longer range plans is now very clear to me. So, too, is the need to recognize and capitalize on the involvement of CBOs in YETP activities designed to serve in-school youth—particularly those concerned with various forms of alternative education—as well as the joint efforts of CBOs and LEAs to serve YETP eligible out-of-school youth. Here, again, is a major mistake I made in planning the mini-conferences. Had I known then what the mini-conference participants have since taught me, I would have arranged for CBO representatives, as well as representatives from both the Prime Sponsor and the LEA, to be present from each community represented at the mini-conference. I think we could all learn from studying the example found in Milwaukee, Wisconsin which involves regular joint meetings of all.

YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements: Where Do We Go From Here?

As a final part of this presentation, I would like to comment briefly on the "Where Do We Go From Here?" question. Again, my remarks are based on what I think I have learned from the 135 participants representing 70 communities where supposedly viable LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements are in operation. I listened to and learned from these participants in approximately 150 hours of intensive discussion and have spent much more time since writing up the notes I took and studying the materials participants gave to me. I do not pretend that these participants have all the answers nor that I heard perfectly what they were trying to say. I do contend that, as experienced practitioners representing both Prime Sponsors and LEAs, their voices deserve to be heard.

The overriding recommendation of these participants was that both Prime Sponsors and LEAs need to pay more attention to and learn to form a joint partnership in meeting the goals of YETP as stated by the Congress which is:

"... to enhance the job prospects and career opportunities of young persons, especially economically disadvantaged youth, to enable them to secure unsubsidized employment in the public and private sectors of the economy."

Prime Sponsors need to recognize the significant shift—from a remedial, specific job training type of goal to a preventive/developmental goal of providing youth with general *employability skills*—found in the YETP legislation as opposed to other portions of the CETA Law. School districts need to recognize that this basic goal of YETP should be an integral part of the goals of American Education—not just an "add on" to be embraced only so long as the YETP funds are made available to LEAs.

The need for joint commitment to and understanding of the meaning and implications of this basic goal must be shared jointly by Prime Sponsors and by

LEAs. This can best be done if LEA and Prime Sponsor personnel, in each community, are willing to talk to each other, to respect each other, to learn from each other, and to work together in a true partnership manner in both forming and in carrying out the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. It is a partnership—not an adversary—relationship that is needed. A partnership that concentrates on how much help accrues to youth, not on which aspect of which “bureaucracy” receives credit for providing that help.

Both Prime Sponsors and LEAs need to recognize the great need to bring equity—not just equality—of opportunity to economically disadvantaged youth in providing them with the basic academic skills and the general employability skills required to change with change in the occupational society. Prime Sponsors need to recognize and accept the fact that many of the special facilities, materials, and procedures paid for by YETP funds to serve the economically disadvantaged can, if LEAs are willing to use their own funds, also be used to meet the needs of non-YETP eligible youth—particularly those who are “almost eligible” and certainly in great need. School systems need to accept responsibility for giving special attention to economically disadvantaged youth while not losing sight of their need to serve all students.

Both Prime Sponsors and LEAs need to recognize that the general employability skills sought through YETP cannot be adequately provided if we wait until youth reach age 16 to begin. Neither will the goals of YETP be met simply by taking more advantage of provisions available for inclusion of 14-15-year-olds. The LEAs must accept responsibility for beginning this task early in the elementary school years. The Prime Sponsors must learn to recognize and appreciate this kind of LEA contribution by rewarding those LEAs who accept it through the agreements negotiated.

Local school districts need to learn much more about Public Sector Employment (PSE) and how to use PSE resources in their total work/education efforts. Prime Sponsors need to understand and deal more effectively with private sector employers if there is to be any hope of expanding career exploration opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth. Both PSE and private sector representatives must become joint partners with Prime Sponsors and LEAs in meeting the goals of YETP.

Both Prime Sponsors and LEAs need to recognize and capitalize on the high degree in similarity of goals existing between YETP and the Career Education Incentive Act. The CETA Law requires that this be done. Even if this were not a legal requirement, it should be done anyway. How best to use CETA Governor's discretionary funds to make this linkage is, as of now, still largely an unsolved problem. Solutions must be sought and found quickly. If such solutions do not involve Vocational Education, as well as Career Education, the youth we all seek to serve will suffer. These youth are too important to allow problems of “turfsmanship” to prevent us from helping them.

Ways must be found to better link the Career Education efforts of LEAs, the YETP total effort, and the Summer Youth Employment Program of CETA to better serve severely economically disadvantaged youth. Our failure to do so in

the past has resulted in a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure for the SYEP Program which need not and should not occur. It is fruitless to think about providing SYEP eligible youth with good work attitudes if the only input is the SYEP experience itself. This experience—badly needed to meet our equity obligations for our most severely economically disadvantaged youth—must be supplemented both by independent LEA efforts and by the joint LEA/Prime Sponsor efforts represented by the YETP agreement.

The special needs of economically disadvantaged youth to acquire a solid foundation in both academic skills and general employability skills may well call for special provisions for Postsecondary Occupational Education for many such youth—and for College/University opportunities for others. This problem has not been adequately solved—or even faced—in many communities. We should delay no longer.

Concluding Remarks

There is much more to share, but time will not permit me to do so. Let me, then, conclude with a few final observations representing things I learned from our mini-conference participants this year.

First, I found myself amazed at how well—and how quickly—YETP has been implemented in the communities represented in these mini-conferences. The amazing thing is how much and how well—not how poorly—YETP has been implemented.

Second, the 70 communities represented in these 15 mini-conferences certainly can—and should—be used to counteract some of the bad press YETP in particular and CETA in general have been receiving. They have solved problems. They have helped youth. They have demonstrated that YETP can work. I have much more confidence in YETP now than I had when this project began. I hope this conference has left you with similar feelings of optimism.

Finally, I am convinced that the basic principles behind and the rationale for the YETP legislation is both sound and needed. I am not all concerned that this is a Department of Labor Law instead of an Education Law. The important thing is that it is a Law very badly needed by the youth of our Nation—and by our Nation itself. It is now up to all of us to join forces to make sure that the basic principles behind this legislation are preserved and implemented. We have already come a long way. There is still much to do.

Liberal Arts Education and Career Education Revisited

Recent actions of the Congress resulting in failure to appropriate any funds for the postsecondary education portion of the Career Education Incentive Act for FY 1979 may be a blessing in disguise. That is, it converted what many in higher education apparently perceived to be a threat to primarily an academic question. It removed the threat associated with the need for immediate action and allowed the luxury—or the necessity (depending on one's point of view)—of further contemplation. I want to try to take advantage of this opportunity here.

Over the last two years, I have published three "thought pieces" on the general topic of career education and higher education along with a number of others dealing with other aspects of postsecondary education. So far as I can tell, these writings have remained largely ignored by the leading proponents of liberal arts education. The most recent example illustrating this point can be seen in the May 1979 issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan* where, in six major articles dealing with liberal arts education, no mention is made of any of these writings. It's difficult to enter into a dialogue on a topic unless someone is willing to respond to the thoughts of others. If those in liberal arts education won't respond to those of us in career education, then our alternative appears to be that we must respond to them. Thus, I would like to use this opportunity to comment on some of the thoughts found in this issue of the *Kappan* with reference to the meaning and goals of liberal arts education. It may be a first step.

To do so, these remarks are divided in three parts: (a) First, I want to comment on some of the meanings associated with the term "liberal arts education;" (b) Second, I want to consider these various meanings in relation to the goals of higher education; and (c) Finally, I would like to offer some thoughts re-affirming my deep and sincere belief that liberal arts education is an essential element in the comprehensive implementation of a career education effort.

Observations on the Meanings of "Liberal Arts Education"

Having neither come from nor participated actively in liberal arts education, I have the great advantages of ignorance in commenting on articles pertaining to the meaning of and need for liberal arts education. To the extent, that ignorance leaves one free of preconceived bias on a topic, it can be an advantage. At least that is the way I am viewing it here.

As I read the six articles in this special issue, I was impressed, as was the guest editor for the issue, with what he referred to as the "pluralism" of meanings associated with the term "liberal arts education." So far as I can tell, there exists at least four basic "faces of liberal arts education." Depending on which "face" one touches, liberal arts education is apparently being defined in terms of: (a) content; (b) process; (c) values; or (d) behaviorial outcomes. Some, of course, are contending that, if one seeks to truly understand the meaning of

"liberal arts education," one must become aware of and contemplate all four faces simultaneously. The arguments being used here are not unlike those being used by persons currently engaged in trying to define "career education." That is, "career education," like "liberal arts education," is also a concept having several "faces."

Recognizing this, it seems clearly apparent that, for some in both liberal arts education and in career education, there cannot be any relationship between the two. It is equally apparent that, for others, the relationships can be very close indeed. Since I obviously belong in the latter "camp," it is important that I make clear why I believe these relationships to be so close. To do so, it will first be necessary for me to divulge the definitional view of "liberal arts education" that holds the greatest meaning for me.

Let me begin by sharing with you a few quotes from the series of articles I have just read. Time, unfortunately, permits only a meager sampling of those thoughts which held great meaning for me, but they will at least illustrate some of the bases on which I have tried to formulate my own thinking.

Christopher J. Hurn, in his article "The Prospects for Liberal Education: A Sociological Perspective," said:

A liberal education requires a great deal more than enrollment in and completion of particular courses in history, literature, and the sciences; it requires some suspension of immediate anxieties, an act of faith that there are larger worlds worth exploring where long-term rewards are rich but short-term benefits are not immediately apparent,

and

Liberal education is a good deal more than the continual posing of searching questions about one's own life and one's position in the world; it involves establishing links between these questions and a scholarly discipline or a particular tradition of inquiry.

Personally, I like both of these possibly contradictory statements very much. I also like the following quotes from an article by Maxine Greene entitled "Liberal Education and the Newcomer:"

To engage with the liberal arts, to become involved with liberal meaning is to learn what it means to engage in rational inquiry, to make critical judgments, to lead an examined life. But it is also to be exposed to a diversity of perspectives upon experience,

and

This is the search that prepares an individual to discover his/her own vision, his/her own voice. But it cannot be successfully undertaken if there is no grasp of a heritage, a tradition, if there is no liberal learning to launch the newcomer on his/her quest.

Robert McClintock went back to the origins of liberal education with the early Greeks in order to form the rationale for his article entitled, "The Dynamics of Decline: Why Education Can No Longer Be Liberal" and said, among other things:

Unless people approach education in full awareness of their prior freedom, seeking to conduct their lives completely involved as

autonomous participants in a common enterprise, there will be no purpose for liberal education, whatever its program,
and

With no alternative to participate, with no alternative but to perform, people are no longer free persons; and with no free persons, there is no one for whom a liberal education might be appropriate.

I did not like McClintock's article because it seemed to carry an implication that liberal education could properly exist only in a society where slavery exists. That is too absolutist a position for me to accept.

The one article in this entire series that appealed to me was written by Harry S. Broudy and entitled, "The Brightest and the Best" in which he stated:

Liberal studies are neither knowledge for the sake of knowledge nor for the sake of a vocation. They are *intrinsic* in that they are undertaken for the sake of the cultivation of a self, a more perfect form of being. They are *extrinsic* as instruments to choice and commitment by an education self,
and

A liberal education should not be judged on the criteria of *knowing that* or *knowing how* but on *knowing with*, not on whether a previously learned content can be recited or applied but by the way those learned contents provide contexts or meaning. To *know with* is to comprehend with a point of view, a value scheme, a style of life. What we know with gives meaning to *what* we know.

As I read these and the other two articles in this series (which I found to be equally good) my belief in the necessity for and the desirability of liberal arts education was reinforced. Moreover, it becomes more clear to me that I am valuing liberal arts education in several ways including: (a) as a means of learning from the past so one can understand the present and plan for the future; (b) as a means of helping the individual develop a useful sense of inquiry, of critical thinking, and the capacity of formulating and applying a personally meaningful set of values to one's life, and (c) the capacity of using previously acquired knowledge to think in a general, not just in a specific, way about new problems. If liberal arts education can, indeed, do all of these things, then it is surely needed and will surely survive. But is it doing so? Can it do so? These questions need to be considered now by viewing liberal arts education as it fits into the total spectrum of the goals of higher education.

The Goals of Higher Education

I am not concerned about—or so naive as to attempt—the task of specifying the goals of higher education here. Rather, I am concerned only with some basic questions regarding the nature, evolution, and application of such goals that seem to me to hold implications for relationships between liberal arts education and career education. It is the concept of goals—not their specification—that now concerns me. Several observations appear to be in order at this point in time.

First, I would hope we could agree that goals for higher education *do* exist and are necessary both to justify its continuing existence and as a basis for evaluating its efficacy. Even those who contend that the reason for learning something is to be found only in the fact that it exists are stating a set of goals for higher education. This means to me that those who attempt to picture the so-called "vocationists" as those who value higher education because it is useful—and to separate them from proponents of liberal arts education on that basis—have no logic to stand on. The concept of "usefulness," it seems to me, applies as much to liberal arts education as it does to those parts of higher education dedicated to professional specialization. The question is not one of "useful or useless" but rather "useful for what?"

Second, it seems to me impossible to separate the concept of "goals for higher education" from the concept of "expectations from higher education." If this is true, then it follows that goals of higher education must be viewed from the standpoint of the general public, parents, students, and of societal decision-makers as well as from the standpoint of institutions of higher education and those who work in such institutions. In making this contention, I am certainly not saying that each of these societal segments is equally "right" but only that each does have some kind of "right" to say what they believe our institutions of higher education should be accomplishing. It is this democratic right that has led to the multiplicity of kinds of higher education institutions that exist in our Nation today.

Having said this, it is immediately necessary to emphasize the special responsibilities that fall on those persons responsible for governing and for serving as professional teaching/administrative personnel in our institutions of higher education. I am particularly worried about the necessity for input by members of the teaching faculty to determination of institutional goals and about relationships between institutional goals and ways in which members of the teaching faculty are evaluated. I have a distinct impression that many faculty members have never seen—let alone thought about implications for their own behavior stemming from—the set of institutional goals that typically appears in the first few pages of the college catalogue. That worries me. It worries me even more when I think about another impression I have; namely, that very few members of the teaching faculty are being evaluated, promoted, and/or dismissed on the basis of contributions they have made toward attainment of the printed goals of the college.

If the goals of liberal arts education within a particular institution bear any kind of resemblance to those I quoted earlier, then it seems to me incumbent upon institutions of higher education embracing such goals to: (a) create the kinds of conditions and facilities that will allow them to be attained; and (b) evaluate members of the liberal arts education faculty primarily on contributions they make toward helping students attain those goals—not on the basis of how many new publications the faculty member published last year or how deeply she/he has pursued his/her own basic research interests. I am particularly concerned about the importance of defining liberal arts education in

terms of process as well as in terms of content—i.e., with the difference between what could be called “liberal arts courses” and “liberal arts education.” Liberal arts courses can be taught cheaply and with little difficulty. Liberal arts education is expensive, time consuming, and demands high standards of performance on the part of faculty members. I think failure to recognize this fact lies very near the root of much of the criticism leveled in recent years on the “liberal arts.”

Fourth, I am concerned about the need for some degree of congruence regarding the goals of higher education: on the part of those who govern and administer it, those who teach in such institutions, and those who come to the institution as students. It is the importance of congruence, not the specific nature of institutional goals, that concerns me here. I have a strong feeling that the current high marks being given to certain vocationally oriented postsecondary institutions is due, in large part, to the fact that congruence of goals is present. Conversely, I have a feeling that a fair amount of criticism now being leveled against some so-called liberal arts colleges is because congruence of goals is lacking on the part of these three key elements. If congruence is to be approached, then the key role of the teaching faculty in bringing this about must, it seems to me, be strongly emphasized. That is, it is in the classroom where the goals of higher education will either be attained or go unmet. In saying this, I am, in no way, denying the right and responsibilities of those who govern and administer our institutions of higher education for setting and defining goals. Rather, I am speaking here only about the probabilities of such goals being met.

Fifth, I find myself concerned today about what appears to me to be an overemphasis, among students, on the importance of the goal of preparation for work accompanied by an underemphasis on the part of many members of the teaching faculty on that same goal. Students cannot become the prime determiners of the goals of higher education because they do not know enough and have not experienced enough of life to assume that responsibility. At the same time, as consumers of higher education offerings, their goals cannot be ignored. If their goals are not as broad nor as encompassing as they should be, then the teaching faculty should seek to broaden them. In doing so, the teaching faculty must, it seems to me, not seek to substitute their own goals for those students bring. Both the goals of the teaching faculty and the goals of students need to be broadened, it seems to me, so that they are more congruent with the total set of goals of the institution in which both participate.

Sixth, I find myself fascinated with the thought that the goals of a particular course can, and should, be multiple in nature. If a particular course is valuable to one student in a particular way, it may well be valuable to another student in a completely different way. If the professor contends that he/she has no interest in having a student use this course in fulfilling the goal of preparation for work, this, in no way, means that the student cannot choose to do so—and succeed. Again, the principle of goal congruence enters in. I have a strong feeling that if students and professors agree on course goals—and if such goals become important to both—the total set of goals are much more likely to be attained.

What worries me is when, in a given class, there is neither mutual discussion regarding the goals of both nor mutual congruence.

If the prime goals of liberal arts education can be said not to include preparation for success in the world of paid employment, this, in no way, means that they have no utility nor applicability to that goal. I do not think it would cheapen or undermine, in any significant way, the goals or importance of liberal arts education if this were to be recognized. I want to conclude by emphasizing this point.

Contributions of Liberal Arts Education To The Goals of Career Education

It would be highly helpful if all those associated with liberal arts education were to recognize that the goals of career education are much more compatible with the goals of liberal arts education than they are with the goals of professional specialization. That is, the goals of career education do not center primarily around the need to equip students with specific, entry level vocational skills that allow them to gain entry into a particular occupational field. Those in career education recognize, applaud, and support the need for professional specialization programs in our institutions of higher education just as we support the need for specific entry level vocational skill training in other kinds of educational institutions. We do so based on the present and projected realities of the occupational society.

It is precisely because of those realities that the concept of career education came on the educational scene several years ago. It grew primarily out of recognition of the fact that, as the need for specific entry level vocational skills becomes more and more *necessary* in our society, such skills become less and less *sufficient* to meet the needs of that society—and of the broader society of which the occupational society is a part. In addition to gaining entry into that society, today's students must also be prepared to change with change—and to make positive contributions to change—in that society. Thus, in addition to specific entry level vocational skills, today's students need such skills as: (1) the discipline of good work habits; (2) basic competence in mathematics and in oral/written communications; (3) a personally meaningful set of work values as a part of their total personal value system; (4) a basic understanding and appreciation of the American system of private enterprise in terms of its past, present, and probable future as contrasted with other parts of the world; (5) self-understanding and understanding of educational and occupational opportunities that are potentially available to them; (6) career decisionmaking skills that incorporate the spirit of inquiry and the application of the scientific method; (7) skills in making unpaid work, as well as paid employment, a meaningful and satisfying part of total lifestyle without giving it undue importance; (8) skills in finding, obtaining, and holding a job; (9) skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as they act to deter full freedom of choice; and (10)

skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself in ways that provide the individual with maximum control over his/her own personal destiny.

I would contend that some of these skills represent responsibilities that faculty persons in liberal arts education should share with their colleagues in professional specialization areas. I would contend that others—particularly those concerned with putting work values in the perspective of one's total set of personal values, those concerned with developing a spirit of inquiry and a responsibility for participating in both planning and living one's future, those concerned with understanding how past and present events have and are contributing to one's total career destiny, those concerned with "work" as a humanistic concept that can give purpose and meaning to life far beyond the narrow confines of the occupational society, and those concerned with helping the individual humanize the workplace for himself or herself may represent an even greater challenge to liberal arts education than to professional specialization elements in higher education. Unless those responsible for the administration and delivery of liberal arts education recognize this, it is highly unlikely that our students will acquire such skills as easily or as quickly as they should.

I, for one, do not believe, in any way, that to impose some responsibility on liberal arts education for making major contributions to the goal of preparing today's college students for work denigrates or degrades other goals of liberal arts education. On the contrary, it seems to me that, if those responsible for liberal arts education will accept this responsibility, the end result could well be the further enhancement and attainment of the many other important goals of liberal arts education. I can only hope that some in liberal arts education will agree.

Contrasts Between the Guidance and the Career Education Movements

The exact role of any segment of society in career education is best determined by its members, not by specialists in career education. That is why OE's Office of Career Education has awarded a contract to the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) to study and clarify the role of the counselor in career education. Similar contracts are currently in operation with several other professional associations, each of whom represents a particular segment of Education. It is not my purpose here to either: (a) perform this contractual assignment for APGA; or (b) dictate to APGA any part of the final set of answers they produce. That assignment must be completed by APGA itself.

Instead, my aim here is to comment on what I perceive to be a number of significant historical contrasts between the relatively older guidance movement and the relatively younger movement called "career education." I am acutely aware of the obvious high degree of bias that I bring to this assignment. Both "guidance" and "career education" are movements composed of a number of "camps," each of which views the movement from a different perspective. Obviously, I belong to only one of those "camps" in both of these important movements. I speak here only for myself, not for either movement.

These remarks are divided in three parts. First, I want to present what seems to me to be some basic similarities between the conceptual basis on which both of these movements was formed. Second, I want to outline some perceptions of what has happened to change the nature of the guidance movement over the last 60 years. Finally, I want to conclude by specifying some hard decisions to be faced by the guidance movement with respect to the current evolving nature of career education.

The Conceptual Bases of Guidance and of Career Education: Some Historical Similarities

The guidance and career education movements share in common three basic conceptual bases in terms of their historical beginnings. Each holds important implications for today's counselors as they consider their possible roles in career education.

First, both movements were born out of a concern for education/work relationship problems facing persons in our society. This can be easily seen if the definitions of "guidance" used by Frank Parsons and the definition of "career education" used by the Congress in writing the CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT—P.L. 95-207—are contrasted. Parsons, you will recall, defined "guidance" as *choosing, preparing for, entering upon, and progressing in an occupation*. The Congress defined "career education" as *career awareness, exploration, planning, and decisionmaking*. In spite of differences in meaning today between the words "career" and "occupation," the basic similarity in these two

movements as attempts to respond to the basic societal need to help individuals solve problems of education/work relationships is clear. American society has supported attempts to meet this need for more than 70 years. Both "guidance" and "career education" gained their initial acceptance through contending that they held potential for meeting this need.

Second, early attempts to provide a conceptual framework leading to definition of the movement bear great similarity when the guidance and career education movements are contrasted. These include such bedrock concepts as: (a) the God-given right of each individual to *choose* her/his own destiny is of paramount importance—(remember, the first action word in Parson's definition is "choose"); (b) the need for the movement is lifelong and includes individuals of all ages; (c) the effort is more properly thought of as a community effort than as an effort of the education system alone—(remember, Parsons started his work with young adult men in a YMCA, not in a school building); (d) within Education, the key "actor" in delivery of the effort is the classroom teacher—(remember Ruth Strang and the "every teacher is a counselor" days?); (e) the movement is developmental/preventive, not remedial, in nature and is intended to be applicable to *all* persons; and (f) the movement is organized around the basic theory and research in career development. In all six of these ways, guidance and career education, in terms of their *beginnings*, share some important basic definitional concepts. Some counselors still believe in these basic concepts that formed the bedrock for the beginnings of the guidance movement. Those who do are sure to share much in common with today's career education "crusaders."

Third, and by far most important, both the guidance movement and the career education movement have evolved more as basic *system solutions* than as a tailor-made response to a *specific problem*. Both have emphasized their potential for *providing help to individuals* much more than they have emphasized the *presence of a problem*. The bedrock parameter these two movements share here is *help-giving*. This perceived basic potential for help-giving has led both movements to expand their concerns—and their claims for effectiveness—far beyond the specific area of work/education relationships. This has led some persons involved in each of these movements to forget why their movement was created in the first place. It has been both a "blessing" and a "curse"—a "blessing" in the sense it has afforded expanded opportunities to serve and a "curse" in that it inevitably leads to accusations of over-promise and under-delivery. Even more, as *system solution efforts*, both movements have called for basic changes in the American system of Education—thus lending themselves to constant criticism on the part of the many who resist change. Operating as a system solution is a "cross" that both guidance and career education have had to bear.

Changes In The Guidance Movement: The Last 60 Years

With such obvious historical parallels in early beginnings, it now seems appropriate to examine the older of these two movements; namely, the guidance

movement, in terms of how it has changed in ways that have assured its survival and growth over the last 60 years. Having been personally a part of the guidance movement for only a little over 30 years, I must draw primarily on the literature and on what I learned, in my first few years in the field, from a number of early guidance leaders, almost all of whom are now dead. I include here my early contacts with such former leaders as (a) Harry Dexter Kitson; (b) Harry Jäger; (c) Cliff Froehlich; (d) Dolph Camp; (e) Floyd Cromwell; (f) Frank Sievers; (g) Harry Smullenberg; (h) Ed Roeber; (i) Ralph Bedell; (j) Bill Dugan; and others—some of whose names are probably unfamiliar to many of today's counselors.

In doing so, I want to limit my remarks to those observations which, to me, hold the greatest implications for the possible future of career education. That is, I make no pretense that this view is either comprehensive or free of bias. I am concerned only about giving today's counselors a perspective they may find useful in considering the counselor's role in career education.

First, I would contend that, with a few notable exceptions (e.g., Meyer Bloomfield in New York City; Detroit, Michigan; and St. Louis, Missouri) it was not until after World War I when guidance began to become a popular topic in American Education. During the 20 years between 1918 and 1938, the guidance concept was championed in American Secondary Education primarily as a school system-wide effort to provide help to students in educational/vocational decisionmaking. The notion of involvement of *all* professional educators, coupled with efforts of the broader community, was the primary "banner" under which guidance operated. Guidance was viewed as a *concept*, not as a *program*. As a result, it is most difficult to determine the extent to which the concept was implemented in American Education during this period of time. It seems clear that it was generally regarded as "a good thing" but no one seemed to know, for sure, exactly what this "good thing" was nor how extensively it was being applied.

Beginning in 1938 with establishment of the first Guidance Branch in USOE, the primary way of measuring progress in the guidance field shifted from measuring the nature and extent of *community efforts* to counting the number of *counselors* who have been employed. Ever since then, this seems to have been the prime criterion used in assessing the "growth" of the guidance movement. It is now common to talk about "growth" in guidance by pointing to the fact there were fewer than 50 school counselors prior to 1920, 3,800 by 1938, 8,200 by 1946, 14,000 by 1953, and over 40,000 today.

Between 1938 and 1958, this effort of the guidance movement to increase the number of counselors was accomplished through a combination of factors including: (a) appointing a State Supervisor of Guidance in every State Department of Education; (b) establishing counselor certification requirements for school counselors; (c) establishing professional associations of counselors (including the eventual merger of several of these into APGA in 1952); and (d) establishment and operation of counselor education programs. I was both a school counselor and a counselor educator during this period of time. As I

recall, my perceptions of what I was to do, as a school counselor, were still heavily weighted toward: (a) an emphasis on career guidance; (b) an emphasis on encouraging classroom teachers to participate in the guidance function; and (c) an emphasis on getting community involvement in the total guidance effort. As a counselor educator during that period of time, I recall that relatively few school systems were employing counselors. However, those who did so knew why they needed them and what they expected them to do—the primary emphasis was clearly on educational/vocational guidance.

Since 1958, with passage of the National Defense Education Act, the pre-occupation of the guidance movement with increasing its emphasis on the counselor—and decreasing its emphasis on the earlier conceptual basis for the guidance movement—has increased still more dramatically. Funds available under Title V-A of NDEA were used to encourage still more K-12 school systems to employ counselors. Funds available under Title V-B were used to greatly increase the quantity—and hopefully the quality—of counselor education programs. Additional “weapons” for use in increasing the number of counselors were found by including a requirement for “counselors” in regional accrediting commission standards and by emphasizing still further the importance of professional standards for counselors—and for counselor education institutions.

There is no doubt but that, to the extent the goal is considered to be simply increasing the number of counselors, one would have to conclude that the guidance movement has met with remarkable success over the last 60 years. However, to the extent the goal is viewed as one of furthering the growth and implementation of the basic concepts of guidance, I would contend the “record of progress” is not nearly so positive. There has been, in my opinion, a very heavy price paid by the guidance movement in order to attain its goal of increasing the number of counselors. That price can be seen in each of the three conceptual bases of guidance outlined earlier.

First, in terms of viewing the primary guidance mission as that of helping persons solve education/work relationship problems, it seems safe to say that there is no general consensus, among professionals in guidance, that this is their primary role. Many do not see this function as *any* part of their current responsibilities. Similarly, those who employ counselors have also learned to avoid viewing this function as their primary reason for doing so. By emphasizing the need for more counselors, we have, to some considerable degree, lost sight of the societal reasons that led to creation of the guidance movement.

Second, in terms of the basic guidance concepts outlined earlier, the guidance movement has moved away from its earlier emphasis on a school system-wide effort, coupled with a broader community effort, and toward a position which assumes the mission will be accomplished through efforts of counselors alone. This has led to downplaying the importance and relevance of the word “guidance” and toward playing up the importance of two other words—namely, “counseling” and “counselor.” More and more, the “guidance job”—whatever that may be—has been seen as “something that counselors do.” As

counselors have thus been led toward defining their functions in terms of things they *can* do by themselves, they have tended *not* to define their functions in terms of things—such as career guidance—that they *cannot* do by themselves. The result, in many settings, is that counselors are doing more and more—about less and less. I point this out as a trend, not as a criticism.

Third, many counselors have been caught in the "system solution trap" inherent in both the guidance and in the career education movements. Counseling, as help-giving, obviously holds potential for use far beyond career guidance. As new mandates have evolved and filtered down through the societal system, counselors have been quick to claim that they have something positive to offer in meeting those mandates. As a result, in addition to "career counselors," we now see such specialists as "drug education counselors," "sex education counselors," "disciplinary counselors," "military counselors," "sex equity counselors," "special education counselors," and a host of other new counselor specialties. It is almost like saying "counseling is part of the solution—what's the problem?" The trend toward viewing the professional counselor as one whose skills can be helpful in meeting a wide variety of kinds of societal mandates is an inevitable consequence of the "system solution" nature of the guidance concept itself. It is something which, as a trend, should be applauded, not deplored. At the same time, there is a tendency to respond to each new mandate through further isolating counselors from others who could help—and, worse, in isolating professional counselors from one another. This, too, is part of the price to be paid for emphasizing the two words "counseling" and "counselor" while de-emphasizing the word "guidance." Specialization leads towards isolation—and isolation leads toward being able to do more and more about less and less.

As a result of these three "prices to be paid" for the remarkable increase in the number of counselors over the last 60 years, it seems to me that the guidance profession is now at a point where it may find it helpful and desirable to re-think its proper role and function in the larger society. I regard viewing the career education concept as one, among several, possible avenues for use in doing so.

The Evolving Nature of the Career Education Movement: Implications for Counselors

As a movement, it seems to me career education has evolved today to about the same point reached by guidance in the mid 1930s. In saying this, I am referring to evolution and acceptance of the movement, not a state of knowledge. Certainly, because career education has taken advantage of a great deal of knowledge—including that learned from the guidance movement—it is, in this sense, far ahead of where guidance was during the 1930s. In terms of conceptual evolution, career education is still committed to each of the basic concepts I listed earlier as ones common to both guidance and career education. In terms of societal acceptance, career education, like guidance in the 1930s, is

generally regarded as a "good thing" in spite of the fact that many do not yet understand what this "good thing" is.

If professional counselors are now to make decisions regarding the extent to which they wish to join the career education "crusade," it seems to me essential that they do so by systematically considering and deciding on the appropriateness of their involvement in each of what I now call "THE FOUR FACES OF CAREER EDUCATION." Let me briefly outline these four "faces" of career education.

First, counselors need to decide the extent to which they wish to become involved in leadership and/or participatory activities in career education's attempts to provide all persons with general employability/adaptability skills. The 10 skills career education seeks to help impart include: (1) basic academic skills; (2) good work habits; (3) personally meaningful work values; (4) understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system; (5) self-understanding and understanding of educational/occupational opportunities; (6) career decisionmaking skills; (7) job seeking/getting/holding skills; (8) skills in making productive use of leisure time; (9) skills in combatting bias and stereotyping as these act as deterrents to full freedom of career choice; and (10) skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself. Career education has contended that these kinds of employability/adaptability skills are badly needed to supplement the specific entry level vocational skills persons are now acquiring through our educational systems. For each of these skills, professional counselors now, it seems to me, must decide the extent to which they see themselves as appropriate providers of such skills. It seems likely that some will be viewed as ones where the counselor should play a leadership role, others where the counselor should play a participatory role, and, perhaps, still others in which counselors have little or no interest in becoming involved.

Second, counselors need to decide the extent to which they wish to become involved in career education's attempt to serve as: (a) a new approach to basic educational change that depends on a "people change," rather than a "program add-on" approach to change; and (b) an attempt to help the education system and the broader community form an effective partnership in meeting the needs of persons for help in the work/education relationships domain. Again, the profession may choose to endorse and participate in one, in both, or in neither of these efforts. It is important that some decisions be made.

Third, counselors need to decide the extent to which they wish to become involved in participating in career education's efforts to serve as a vehicle for use in responding to the currently popular kinds of educational "mandates" that exist. Such mandates include those related, for example, to: (1) "back to basics"; (2) "better discipline in the schools"; (3) "attendance"; (4) "vandalism"; (5) "sex equity"; (6) "needs of persons with handicaps"; (7) "needs of economically disadvantaged persons"; and (8) "needs of minority persons." As each new mandate comes in as a "wave" in Education, a basic conceptual movement—like guidance or career education—is faced with a choice of either "riding the wave" or "being engulfed by it." Since both guidance and career

education seem likely to be caught in the position of "riding many of the same waves," it is logical to ask if they should ride them together or separately? Once again, there is probably no easy or universal answer to be found here. It seems likely that professional counselors will give different answers depending on which "wave" one refers to.

Finally, counselors need to decide the extent to which they wish to become involved in career education's attempts to restore dignity, respect, and personal meaning for two key words in our society—"Education" and "work." A great deal of the career education effort is currently being devoted to conveying an understanding that the word "Education" means something considerably more than the word "schooling" and that "education" is a vital factor in the well-being of our Nation and its citizens. Similar effort is being aimed, by career education, at re-defining the word "work" in ways that allow it to extend considerably beyond the meaning of "paid employment" so as to include both paid and unpaid work done as part of the individual's total lifestyle throughout his/her lifetime. Once again, this is a part of career education that professional counselors can choose to join, to reject, or to ignore.

Concluding Thoughts

The guidance movement and the career education movement share much in common in terms of their historical evolution and beginning basic concepts. It seems to me that, in its desire to ensure the presence of adequate numbers of professionally prepared counselors, the guidance movement has had to pay the price of moving away from some of these basic concepts. As I see it, career education offers the guidance movement an opportunity to now use its strength of numbers to return to the promotion of the basic concepts on which the guidance movement was founded. Career education, without doubt, desperately needs professional counselors as members of the career education "team." I hope this presentation has provided some rationale and stimulus for bringing the guidance and career education movements closer together. Those we both seek to serve need this to happen.

School Volunteers and Career Education: Some Conceptual Thoughts

A speaker who knows less about his topic than does the audience is in trouble. The only reasonable way out is to: (a) expose the speaker's ignorance about the topic; and (b) seek to broaden the topic so that it includes something the speaker knows more about than does the audience. This is the approach I want to take in addressing both the subject of "school volunteers" and the subject of "career education" in a single presentation.

There are four specific subtopics around which these remarks are organized. First, I want to comment, in a generic way, on the topic of school volunteers in American education. My purpose in doing so is to let you know my current biases in hopes that you can reduce my ignorance on this topic. Second, I want to comment briefly on the concept of career education. Third, I would like to offer some thoughts regarding aspirations I have for use of school volunteers in implementing the career education effort. Finally, I will close with a few thoughts regarding conceptual relationships between the topics of "volunteerism" and "career education."

School Volunteers and American Education

I begin with a few thoughts regarding why we have school volunteers in American education. Having read nothing on this subject, I do so completely uninhibited by previous knowledge of research. This will, I am sure, be readily apparent.

First, it seems to me that those who volunteer to work in school settings must surely, by and large, be persons who believe and have a basic confidence in the American system of public education. I would hope that school volunteers are much more motivated to participate in improving American education than in correcting its deficiencies. Their basic motivation must stem from a recognition of how important American education is, not from how badly it has served our nation's youth. In short, it seems to me that school volunteers must surely be persons who are basically optimistic, rather than pessimistic, about our American system of public education. If so, school volunteers share a very important and basic bond with those associated with the career education effort.

Second, it appears to me that a second source of motivation for persons to serve as school volunteers has been an interest in increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching/learning process. To this end, many school volunteers have performed tasks which professional school personnel simply have not had time to do. Others have concentrated on performing tasks that, while essential in the total educative process, do not demand the skills or expertise of the professional educator. In either case, the goal has been one of increasing the quality of delivery of education without greatly increasing the costs of education. This goal, too, is one that is basic to the entire education effort.

There are a host of obvious dangers in endorsing this source of motivation as a bedrock basis for the school volunteer movement in America. One obvious danger is that, if school volunteers are justified on this basis, it is theoretically possible to contend that school volunteers may not be needed. That is, given sufficient financial resources, the American education system could afford to hire personnel to perform the tasks done by school volunteers. An equally obvious related danger is that this rationale may lead to resistance, among professional educators, to the use of school volunteers if such volunteers are seen, in any way, as taking jobs away from professional educators. In these times of teacher surpluses, this danger may well become apparent in many communities. A final obvious danger in endorsing this source of motivation is that it inevitably leads to partial acceptance of responsibility for the quality of delivery of education by the school volunteer. To hold such volunteers partially accountable for the quality of education may discourage some from participating as volunteers.

This leads to a third possible basic source of motivation for persons to serve as school volunteers; namely, a recognition that professional educators do not themselves possess all the skills, knowledge, or resources that today's students need for a good education. Those who endorse this source of motivation are persons willing to accept a resurrection of responsibility on the part of the broader community for assistance in attaining some of the goals of education. It recognizes that our American system of education has, over the years, been asked to accomplish tasks it cannot possibly do without the participation of the broader community. To the extent this source of motivation is valid, it serves as a justification for school volunteers that is dependent neither on the availability of school finances nor the relative supply of teachers. The goal is one of adding additional kinds of expertise and resources to those now existing in the education system. This goal, like the other two, is also basic to the concept of career education.

Those embracing this third possible source of motivation as legitimate will immediately see some of its implications for change in the school volunteer movement. Among the most obvious of these are recognition of the fact that school volunteers must; (a) include employed women as well as full-time homemakers; (b) males from a very wide spectrum of society; and (c) efforts that extend to after-school and evening hours as well as those undertaken during the school day.

My personal conviction is that all three of these sources of motivation are defensible and, in combination, amount to more than a simple sum of their parts. Each forms an essential part of the bedrock philosophy behind career education. If those in the school volunteer movement perceive them as equally essential parts of their bedrock philosophy, then it seems apparent that the topic of "school volunteers and career education" is one worthy of discussion. Under this assumption, let me now turn to a discussion of career education and examples of ways in which the help of school volunteers is needed in delivery of career education.

The Concept of Career Education

Having published a wide variety of single sentence definitions of the term "career education," I have finally reached a state where I no longer think this to be a viable kind of activity. Instead, I am now willing to say that the "elephant" of career education is one that can be touched in four basic ways, each of which would lead one to believe that he or she understands what "career education" means. I must, therefore, begin by trying to "touch the elephant" lightly in all four basic places.

In one sense, career education can be defined as an effort to bring a more proper and appropriate emphasis to the goal of education as preparation for work to American education. From this standpoint, career education is pictured as an attempt to add to American education's traditional emphasis of providing school leavers with specific entry level vocational skills, an additional set of general employability/adaptability skills that will help persons change with change in a rapidly changing occupational society. These include such things as: (a) the basic academic skills; (b) good work habits; (c) a personally meaningful set of work values; (d) an understanding and appreciation of the American system of private enterprise; (e) self-understanding and understandings of educational/occupational opportunities; (f) career decisionmaking skills; (g) job seeking/getting/holding skills; (h) skills in making productive use of leisure time; (i) skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as deterrents to full freedom of career choice; and (j) skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself. These skills are ones needed by all students—those who will go the college as well as those who will not. Their development demands an emphasis throughout the educational system beginning in the early elementary school years and continuing through all of education.

A second way to define career education is to picture it as an attempt to embark on a new road to educational change—one that seeks basic educational change without the necessity for addition of greatly increased expenditures of dollars, addition of new courses, or addition of large numbers of new staff. Instead, career education's basic approach to educational change is to depend on: (a) changing the attitudes and actions of today's educators in today's buildings with today's courses and today's curriculums; and (b) drawing on the resources of the broader community for expertise and facilities not available in today's system of public education. It seeks change through the power of persuasion, not the power of position. It has no strength itself in a programmatic sense, but rather derives its strengths from the contributions of existing educational programs coupled with the resources of the broader community. Its efforts can be seen in all parts of education, but it is not a new kind of educational program to be added to all those now in existence. It is an effort, but it is *not* a program.

Third, career education, as a methodological effort, can be viewed as a vehicle for use in responding to a wide variety of "mandates of the moment" in American education. Crisis and problems are an essential part of education. Once identified at the local community level, vehicles must be found for use in

attacking the problem. Career education is one such vehicle that can be used for responding to several such possible problems including: (a) "Back to Basics;" (b) improved classroom discipline; (c) juvenile delinquency; (d) bias and stereotyping (e) meeting the needs of economically disadvantaged and persons with handicaps; and (f) competency based education. In each of these examples, a career education effort is one among several viable approaches a school system could take in attacking the problem. It is hard to think of any other single approach to educational change that holds this much potential for use in attacking the diverse mandates, crises, and problems that come and go in education.

Finally, a fourth basic way in which career education can be defined is as an attempt to restore proper dignity, respect, and meaning to two words that form basic cornerstones of American society. These two words are "education" and "work." Both of these key words are held in low esteem today by many Americans—youth and adult alike. One of the basic reasons why this is so is that relationships between education and work have changed and continue to change rapidly. Career education can be pictured as an attempt to bring an understanding of and capability for dealing with education/work relationships to citizens in our society. To do so, it is essential to recognize that the word "education" carries far broader meaning than the word "schooling" and that the word "work" carries far broader meaning than the term "paid employment." Career education is an attempt to clarify education/work relationships and their implications for personal decisionmaking with these broader definitions of both terms. If both words are properly understood, each will once again become the "good" word our nation needs it to become. In this sense, career education can be defined as a kind of public relations effort. I have no apologies to make to those who wish to view it in that manner.

The Need for School Volunteers in Career Education: Illustrative Examples

Since career education is an effort that seeks to exist without the addition of a new breed of specialists at the building level, there are an unusually large number of ways in which school volunteers are needed to make this effort successful. These needs can be thought of both from the standpoint of increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the effort and from the standpoint of providing resources and expertise not present among professional educators. Both kinds of examples will be presented here.

First, in terms of volunteer efforts that will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the career education effort, I would list the following as obvious illustrative examples:

1. Identifying resource persons from the business/labor/industry community and recruiting them for participation in career education.
2. Building and maintaining lists of community resource persons.

3. Operating a system for putting community resource persons together with teachers who need them in a particular class at a particular time.
4. Identifying sites in the business/labor/industry community for possible use in field trips and for various kinds of career exploration.
5. Arranging for field trips for individual students and/or groups of students to various sites in the business/labor/industry community.
6. Providing transportation for students to sites in the business/labor/industry community.
7. Identifying, collecting, organizing, and operating a file system for career/educational information in the school building.
8. Operating a system for cataloguing and making career education materials available to teachers.
9. Helping teachers build "homemade" career education materials for use in the classroom.
10. Finding reading materials from current magazines and periodicals that can provide a "careers" emphasis when used in reading assignments.

Professionals in education exist in most school systems who are able to show school volunteers how to do each of these things. These 10 illustrative activities obviously could, given sufficient funds, be carried out by professional educators themselves. Such funds are not likely to become available. Instead, the relatively small amounts of money expected to be made available for career education is badly needed for the kinds of "people change" efforts career education requires. Thus, even in a very practical budget sense, school volunteers will obviously play a crucial role—either by their presence or by their absence—in determining the success or failure of career education.

But this is only part of the picture of need for school volunteers in career education. A second set of examples illustrative of the need for resources and expertise not present among professional educators is equally important to present including:

1. Serving as a career resource person in the classroom to discuss one's current (and/or former) occupations.
2. Serving as members of a community career education action council.
3. Speaking to representatives of such community groups as the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, YMCA, American Legion, Women's American ORT, Junior League, AARP, Business and Professional Women's Club, etc., about career education and the need for them to join in this community effort.
4. Devising and operating a media campaign designed to acquaint the broader community with the career education effort.
5. Serving as liaison between the school system and various community youth organizations deeply involved in career education such as junior achievement, 4-H clubs, Explorer Division-BSA, Girl Scouts, etc.
6. Serving as role models for youth in breaking down bias and stereotyping as deterrents to full freedom of career choice for all persons.

7. Devising career simulation packages of activities for use by students interested in exploring their interests and aptitudes in various careers.
8. Participating in teacher in-service activities aimed at helping teachers better understand the career implications of their subject matter.
9. Serving as resource persons with whom youth can visit about the present and/or former occupations of the school volunteer.
10. Operating a career exploration simulation center where students can try out, through "hands-on" experience, their interests and aptitudes for various careers.

Again, I have chosen to list only 10 illustrative activities—partly because of time constraints and partly to again emphasize that this is only a partial listing. Without the volunteer involvement of the broader community, these kinds of crucial career education activities are unlikely to be carried out. They obviously illustrate the need to expand the corps of school volunteers to include more men and women who are employed and those who have retired. Just as obviously, they illustrate the need for the concept of the school volunteer to extend beyond the school setting and beyond the regular school day. If the first set of illustrative examples I presented relate to the efficiency and effectiveness of career education, this second set must be said to relate to the basic viability of the concept itself. That is, without volunteers, the concept of career education itself is invalid.

Concluding Thoughts

I wish to make mention, at this point, one of the biggest reasons why I hope school volunteers will become more active in career education. I refer to the key role the concept of "volunteerism" itself fits into the career education concept. That concept is a key part of the way in which career education defines the word "work." "Work," to those of us in career education, is defined as:

Conscious effort, other than that whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.

That definition obviously includes unpaid work—including volunteer work—as well as work in the world of paid employment. It places primary emphasis on the human need of all human beings: to do—to achieve—to accomplish something that is constructive and worthwhile. The personal reasons why any individual should choose to work as a school volunteer must surely be related to the humanistic way in which we have defined the word "work" in career education.

I would hope that, by becoming a school volunteer and embracing the humanistic values of unpaid work, most members of this audience have already embraced the bedrock of the career education concept. I hope, further, that you will make decisions to join us in the career education "crusade." You are sorely needed and can make great contributions.

Career Education for Exceptional Individuals: Challenges for the Future

The 11 institutes and 118 program sessions associated with this conference have clearly demonstrated the need for, nature of, and pertinent methodology for delivering effective career education to exceptional individuals. The substantive content of this conference represents a quantum leap in knowledge over that found in 1973 when CEC, working cooperatively with the American Vocational Association, sponsored its first national conference on career education. Much of the credit for this belongs to the CEC leadership. No professional association has exhibited a greater sustaining commitment to career education than has CEC. I would like to express here my personal gratitude to and respect for the significant contributions the Council For Exceptional Children has made to enhancing both the conceptualization and the effective delivery of career education.

I am very pleased that topics included in this effort have ranged from the early elementary school years, through the secondary school and college setting all the way to the adult learner. I am similarly pleased to note that, among the topics considered, some attention has been devoted to providing career education for gifted and talented persons as well as for persons with handicaps. So, too, was I pleased to see the home/family structure and the business/labor/industry community addressed as major topics on this agenda. All of these things stand as clear evidence that CEC is, indeed, talking about true career education.

The single most positive thing about these programs, in my opinion, is that they represent a very good mix between presenters who are experts in special education and presenters who have their prime expertise in career education. The dual commitment seen here represented by experts in special education dedicated to learning more about career education coupled with a commitment by experts in career education to learn more about special education is, to me, the greatest strength of this conference—and our greatest hope for still greater progress in the future.

It is the future of career education for exceptional individuals that I have been asked to address. I want to do so from three perspectives: (a) basic emphases in career education for exceptional children that must be highlighted; (b) potential of career education for serving as a vehicle for meeting the needs of exceptional individuals; and (c) current and projected commitments of OE's Office of Career Education to this important effort.

Basic Benchmarks In The Career Education Concept

The future of career education for exceptional individuals will, to a very large degree, be determined by the extent to which professionals in special

education recognize, endorse, and implement each of the basic elements in the career education concept. Of all such elements that could be named, there are five that are especially crucial.

1. Career education calls for extending the goal of education as preparation for work beyond vocational/occupational education. As vocational education's emphasis on providing persons with specific marketable entry level vocational skills becomes more and more necessary, it becomes less and less sufficient for today's population. In addition to such specific entry level vocational skills, persons increasingly need the adaptability skills of career education that will enable them to change with change in the occupational society. Such skills include: (a) the basic academic skills; (b) good work habits; (c) personally meaningful work values; (d) an understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system; (e) self-understanding and understanding of educational/occupational opportunities; (f) career decisionmaking skills; (g) job seeking/getting/holding skills; (h) skills in making productive use of leisure time; (i) skills required for combatting bias and stereotyping as deterrents to full freedom of choice; and (j) skills required for humanizing the workplace for oneself. These are the skills career education seeks to impart.

If such skills are to be imparted to exceptional individuals as well as all others, then it is obvious that this effort must begin no later than the beginning of elementary education and extend throughout all of adult education. The special education teacher in an elementary school setting has fully as much responsibility for implementing career education as does his/her counterpart in the secondary school. So, too, do individuals charged with meeting the needs of exceptional individuals in the college/university and the adult education setting. It is essential that this most basic challenge of career education be understood and accepted by those in special education.

2. Career education is an effort to be delivered in American education through a "drawing out", not an "adding on" approach to educational change. Career education seeks to build no "empire" of new courses, curriculums, buildings, or specialists at the classroom level. Rather, it operates from a basic assumption that the basic skills it seeks to impart are already an inherent part of the total curriculum. They can be effectively delivered by simply "drawing out" what is already present but currently underemphasized in many classrooms.

This means that, if effective career education is to be delivered to exceptional individuals, it will be accomplished primarily through the efforts of professionals in special education, not specialists in career education. Specialists in career education will play a facilitative/resource role but the prime delivery agent within Education for career education will be the classroom teacher. Thus, the future of career education for exceptional individuals is largely in the hands of classroom teachers in special education.

3. The career education concept represents a fusion of the career development process and the teaching/learning process. The career education effort is organized around the career development process but it is

delivered, to a very large extent, through the teaching/learning process. In its delivery, career education asks classroom teachers to increase educational productivity through: (a) showing students the importance of subject matter by seeing how it is needed in work; (b) providing a positive climate of rewarding work done by the student in the classroom; (c) inserting variety into the teaching/learning process through using the resources of the broader community; and (d) emphasizing and rewarding the practice of good work habits. It is important to understand that, in a generic sense, these are the four basic approaches taken by industry to increase industrial productivity. Career education simply seeks to adopt them to the classroom in an effort to increase educational productivity.

This basic approach to delivering career education through the teaching/learning process is at least as applicable to the teacher of exceptional individuals as it is to any other teacher. The extent to which this approach to teaching is applied to exceptional individuals—whether they be “mainstreamed” or in a special setting—will, to a very large degree, determine the future effectiveness of career education for exceptional individuals.

4. The career education concept operates, at a bedrock level, with a humanistic definition of the word “work.” The word “work,” as it is used in career education, refers to the human need of all human beings to do—to accomplish—to achieve. It is the need to be someone through knowing that one has done something—the need to know that one is needed by someone else for what one can contribute. Former President Lyndon Johnson put it well when he said: “To hunger for use and to go unused represents the greatest hunger of all.” Thus, those who accept career education must recognize that it extends far beyond the world of paid employment to include such areas as volunteerism, unpaid work of various kinds, work in the home/family structure, work performed in productive use of leisure time, and even the *work* of the student in the classroom. Career education’s basic commitment is to meeting this human need for work somewhere in the individual’s total lifestyle—even for those persons who cannot meet this need through the occupations they find in the world of paid employment.

This means that teachers of exceptional individuals must extend their thinking about career education far beyond the world of paid employment to the total lifestyle of the persons being served. The prime emphasis must be on the individual, not on the narrow world of the occupational society. The future of career education for exceptional individuals will be greatly affected by the extent to which this concept is accepted and implemented by professionals in the field of special education.

5. Career education is a community effort, not simply an effort of the formal Education system. The expertise required for the effective delivery of career education is found, in part, in the business/labor/industry/government community, not in the Education system alone. In addition, the career education concept asks those who study it to recognize that the Education system is but one among several community elements who act as a delivery agent for

career education. Both the responsibility and the accountability for career education must be extended beyond the formal Education system to the broader community. In addition to the business/labor/industry/government community, the home/family structure must join with the Education system in a collaborative effort to deliver effective career education.

This means that specialists in the education of exceptional individuals must be willing to endorse and to participate in career education as a collaborative community effort—and to share the authority, as well as the responsibility, for that effort. Career education cannot hope to succeed if it operates in an isolationist framework within the formal Education system. The future of career education for exceptional individuals will be heavily dependent on the degree to which this concept is accepted and implemented.

Each of these five elements has been well illustrated in more than one of the programs included in this conference. I emphasize them here, not because they are new, but rather simply because they seem to me to represent the basic benchmarks that will determine the future of career education for exceptional individuals. While they are undoubtedly very familiar to members of this audience, I would suggest that there is much to do before they are either understood or accepted by many professionals in special education. The challenges here are clear.

Career Education: A Vehicle For Use By Special Education

It is easy to see why career education advocates welcome the endorsement and participation of professionals in special education in the career education effort. The future of career education, it seems to me, will depend heavily on the extent to which those in special education recognize and use career education as a vehicle for meeting their own professional responsibilities. I would like here to outline briefly three basic reasons why professionals in special education should seek to utilize career education as a vehicle for accomplishing their goals.

First, and most important of course, the career education delivery system is badly needed by exceptional individuals. The human need to find personal meaning in and reward from work, as part of total lifestyle, is certainly a basic need of exceptional individuals as well as all others. This includes, but is not limited to, the need to find meaning, success, and satisfaction in work performed in the world of paid employment. The adaptability skills of career education may well, for many exceptional individuals, be even more crucial to their career success than are the specific vocational skills they acquire in the formal Education system. Personally, I cannot imagine a truly meaningful Individual Education Plan (IEP) for exceptional individuals that does not include an emphasis on the skills career education seeks to impart. I can only hope that this will become a reality in the near future.

Second, it seems to me that career education holds high potential for use in special education's current efforts aimed toward "mainstreaming" exceptional

individuals into regular classrooms. It is a clear way of showing regular classroom teachers needs shared in common by exceptional individuals and other individuals in the classroom. Moreover, it holds high potential for use in helping regular classroom teachers overcome biases and stereotyping problems they may have with respect to exceptional individuals. When the exceptional individual is allowed to experience success through a career education activity, part of that feeling of worth for that individual extends to the teacher as well as to the person involved. When regular classroom teachers study the career implications of their subject matter for exceptional individuals, they are certain to learn things that will help them better understand and appreciate the potential contributions such individuals can make in the total society. The use of exceptional individuals as career role models may be as important for the education of the teacher as it is for his/her students. In all these ways, career education, it seems to me, holds very high potential for serving as a vehicle for overcoming bias and stereotyping in the regular classroom both on the part of regular teachers and on the part of other students. The potential of career education in this regard has, to date, been greatly underutilized so far as I can tell.

Third, it seems to me that career education holds equally high potential for serving as a vehicle for reducing bias and stereotyping of exceptional individuals on the part of both the business/labor/industry/government community and on the part of parents of such students. If "mainstreaming" is followed, resource persons from the business/labor/industry community will encounter exceptional individuals in almost every classroom. They will be forced to think of ways in which such persons could participate in the part of the occupational society they represent. When regular teachers take their students on field trips, encourage them to engage in "shadow," work experience, or internship experiences in the world of paid employment, provisions will obviously have to be made for exceptional individuals as well as for all others. At the very least, this will result in increased awareness of and attention to architectural barriers found in the occupational society. At best, it will serve as an effective vehicle for reducing bias and stereotyping among employers as well as among regular classroom teachers.

The whole topic of bias and stereotyping is inextricably tied in with the career education concept. Those who use the career education effort as a vehicle for overcoming bias and stereotyping will, it seems to me, find it to be effective. Because the concerns of career education apply equally as well to exceptional individuals as they do to all others, it is a potentially very powerful vehicle. I would hope that it is so recognized by professionals in special education.

OE's Office of Career Education's Commitment To Exceptional Individuals

The first piece of career education legislation enacted by the Congress—P.L. 93-380, Sec. 406—"Career Education"—called for a special emphasis on

career education for persons with handicaps. The newest Federal legislation for career education—P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act"—carries that emphasis still further. There is no doubt but that the Congress has intended, from the beginning, that career education efforts should include a conscious emphasis on meeting the career education needs of exceptional individuals.

Operating under P.L. 93-380 for the last four years, OE's Office of Career Education has made a conscious effort to meet this congressional mandate. Of 13 categories used for funding of grant proposals, two have been specifically directed toward exceptional individuals—one for persons with handicaps and the other for gifted and talented individuals. Of the approximately \$40 million dollars available for use in the total career education demonstration effort, more than \$3.5 million has been used in these two categories. This includes a total of 38 grants and contracts, many of whose Project Directors have been included as presenters at this conference. The second largest contract ever issued by OCE was in the area of bias and stereotyping and is currently in operation. Staff members from OCE have participated in a wide variety of national and State conferences concerned with career education for exceptional individuals. These efforts have added to the \$3.5 million figure mentioned earlier.

The most significant action of OCE, however, has been our effort to infuse an emphasis on providing effective career education for exceptional individuals within all grants funded by OE's Office of Career Education. There is no current OCE Project Director who has not been in attendance at a special workshop aimed at the potential of career education for serving as a vehicle for reducing bias and stereotyping. Each of these Project Directors has been given a resource handbook prepared by Mr. Terry Newall of our OCE staff that specifically addresses methods and resources available for use in providing effective career education for exceptional individuals. In short, we in OE's Office of Career Education have been engaged in a serious and, in my opinion, a significant effort to "mainstream" the topic of career education for exceptional individuals into every project we fund. This effort, coupled with the specific demonstration efforts mentioned earlier, means that well over 10 percent of the total OCE effort has been, and continues to be, devoted toward providing career education for exceptional individuals.

This, in no way, should be taken to mean that we think we have done enough. Our hope is that, in the future, we can find an increasing number of ways in which our efforts can be linked with those of persons whose primary concerns lie in serving the needs of exceptional individuals. Our specific efforts in this area will be increased if we have the funds available for doing so. We hope to be able to devote far greater effort to providing assistance to others who are also committed to this area.

Concluding Remarks

The need for career education on the part of exceptional individuals is undeniably real—and growing bigger. That need will never be met through the efforts of OE's Office of Career Education or by the small band of career education specialists that now exist in various parts of the Nation. To even pretend to take this route would be antagonistic to the nature of the career education concept itself. That is, career education is an effort that seeks to be delivered through existing programs and personnel, not through creation of a new special "empire." This means that the future of career education for exceptional individuals is largely in the hands of professionals in the field of career education. In my opinion, that is the way it should be.

Community Colleges and the Career Education Incentive Act

It is too early to make definitive statements regarding specific priorities to be assigned in administering grants and contracts under the postsecondary education portion of the Career Education Incentive Act. The final rules and regulations for this act have yet to be published. It is, however, not too early to begin preliminary thinking regarding aspirations for this portion of the act. My purpose here is to share with you some of my current aspirations regarding participation of community colleges under section 11—"Postsecondary educational demonstration projects" of the act. I do so in hopes that your reactions will help me to sharpen, refine, revise, and expand such aspirations.

There is, it seems to me, a logical implication that the rather sizeable demonstration effort envisioned in this section over the five years of the act may well lead to an eventual piece of career education implementation legislation at the postsecondary level. This, as you know, what has happened in the case of the K-12 school systems. Thus, in thinking about the long run goals of this demonstration effort, I find myself assuming it will eventually point the way toward implementation legislation. If this assumption is correct, the demonstration efforts to be funded will be of critical importance. In fact, it seems safe to say the ways in which this demonstration effort are handled will be a major factor in determining whether this assumption is valid or invalid. This makes our initial strategies even more important. Your help is badly needed and most earnestly sought. I hope you will respond to this request.

To begin this hoped for dialogue, I would first like to offer a few observations regarding the general orientation with which I view this section of the act. Following this, I would like to comment briefly on each of the three major purposes toward which funds may be directed in this section of the act.

A General Orientation to Section 11 of P.L. 95-207

My general feeling, at this point in time, is that I would hope that, of the demonstration funds made available for this portion of the act, about 1/3 would be spent on community college demonstrations, about 1/3 on career education demonstrations in four-year college/university settings, and about 1/3 in the domain of adult/continuing/recurrent education (which obviously could include both community colleges and four-year degree granting institutions.) I can, at this point in time, see no logical rationale for making a different division of financial effort. This is the first, among many ideas to be transmitted here, on which I need advice and reactions.

Second, it is very clear, from the wording of the law itself, that all demonstration projects to be funded will have to be judged, in part, on the adequacy of their evaluation plans. The Congress has made this a special requirement of the legislation and it must be emphasized. There is, of course, no requirement that a demonstration project be successful. There is a requirement that clear evidence be made available concerning its effectiveness—or lack of effectiveness. There is no doubt in my mind but that the strength of the evaluation component will play a significant role in determining whether or not any project is funded.

Third, the law is clear that we may use both grants and contracts for purposes of administering this section of the law. My general feeling is one that favors the grant approach over the contract approach. I base this on the fact that grant proposals seek to capitalize on the wisdom and ingenuity of those who write the grant applications whereas responses to contracts issued by OE are limited strictly to the ideas and procedures specified in the request for proposal itself. I would, in general, feel much more comfortable relying on wisdom found among practitioners in the field than on the limited insights and understandings available to those of us within OE who write contract language for RFPs. Whether a grant or a contract procedure is used, it is obvious that the list of OCE readers with expertise in the community college field will have to be greatly expanded. I am hoping that many community college experts will seek to become listed on the roles of OCE proposal readers.

Fourth, it seems to me there is a very great deal of leeway in the types of projects that might be funded in that the Congress defined career education in terms of various components of the career development process rather than in terms of specific activities for this postsecondary demonstration portion. The only restriction imposed by Congress in this definition is that no activities involving specific job skill training can be included. This eliminates only the element of traditional vocational/occupational education instruction. It does not, of course, eliminate career education activities in which persons employed in vocational or occupational education might engage.

Fifth, a clear restriction has been imposed by the Congress requiring that all projects funded under this section either be free of bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicaps or that they be aimed at eliminating such stereotyping. My general feeling, at this point in time, is that we should concentrate much more attention on making sure that funded projects are free of bias and stereotyping than on funding special projects designed to eliminate bias and stereotyping. I base this on the fact that this is a career education law, not a law centered around bias and stereotyping. Important as bias and stereotyping are, they represent only one part of a total career education effort and must, it seems to me, be viewed in this perspective. If we provide adequate emphasis to this area in criteria used to evaluate project proposals, it seems to me we will have fully met the intent of the Congress. I raise this here as one more example of a major problem on which advice and suggestions are being sought.

Finally, as a general principle, I find myself inclined toward a policy of funding proposals only on an annual basis with new applications required each year over those whose efforts extend over a multi-year period. We have found, with our earlier demonstration efforts, that using this procedure has been effective in stimulating maximum productivity during a single 12 month period, in generating evaluative criteria that can be applied at the end of a 12 month period, and in stimulating a variety of kinds of new proposals each year. It has not, so far as I can tell, discouraged successful applicants in any given year from submitting proposals for the next year. Obviously, this is a point on which there is strong professional differences of opinion both within the Federal government and among practitioners in the field. Once more, your thoughts, advice, and suggestions are sought.

Based on this general perspective, I would now like to turn to the task of sharing with you some initial thoughts regarding each of the three major purposes for which funds can be made available under this portion of the act.

Programs of National Significance or of Special Value in Promoting Career Education

Section 11 of P.L. 95-207 specifies the first purpose for which funds may be expended in the following words:

"(1) may have national significance or be of special value in the field of career education in postsecondary educational programs.

It seems clear to me that, in using the term "national significance," the Congress has intended for us to search out and fund demonstration efforts that hold obvious implications for being replicated in settings other than the one in which they are conducted. Because of the wide diversity existing among community colleges in terms of size, populations being served, rural versus urban settings, and the relative emphasis placed on liberal arts as opposed to occupational education, it seems further that, in our pattern of demonstration efforts, we will best meet the congressional intent if we keep such major factors in mind in establishing categories for funding purposes. It is already apparent to me that the general set of funding categories appropriate for use in community college settings should be different from the general set used in identifying and funding projects in four-year college/university settings. Of all the basic decisions to be made within OCE, the most important will be determination of funding categories representing discrete areas for which proposals are to be invited. As of now, no firm decisions have been reached with respect to this crucial area. I raise the problem here in order to seek input in the form of advice and suggestions. I very much hope that many are forthcoming.

The general problem, in terms of "national significance" projects, is that of producing projects that demonstrate the best and most effective ways in which a wide variety of kinds of career education implementation problems facing community colleges can be solved. The number of possible problems whose

solution is to be demonstrated will be limited only by the imagination and expertise of those submitting proposals. A few examples of such major problems that, at this early stage, seem apparent to me include:

1. Demonstrating ways in which the teaching faculty in both liberal arts and in occupational education will work together to deliver career education.
2. Demonstrating ways in which the community college will lead and/or participate in the establishment and operation of community career education action councils.
3. Demonstrating ways in which YEDPA funds available from CETA prime sponsors can be used together with career education funds in ways that promote the mutual accomplishment of both YEDPA and career education goals.
4. Demonstrating ways in which community resources can best be utilized in a truly collaborative career education effort in the community college settings.
5. Demonstrating ways in which that part of the career education concept related to preparing persons to engage in unpaid work as part of productive use of leisure time can best be made a part of a community college career education effort.
6. Demonstrating ways in which a meaningful and effective career education effort can be carried out for mid-age adults as well as for younger persons enrolled in community college settings.
7. Demonstrating the best ways in which career education efforts at the community college level can be merged with those now in existence at the K-12 level and/or at the four-year college/university level.
8. Demonstrating ways in which alumni of community colleges can best be utilized as resource persons in community college career education efforts.
9. Demonstrating how effective career education can best be provided such special segments of the community college population as persons with handicaps, gifted/talented persons, persons from various ethnic backgrounds, and persons in their retirement years.
10. Demonstrating how various kinds of youth groups existing on the community college campus can best contribute to an effective career education effort.

I mention only 10 possible examples here for two basic reasons. First, I hope these 10 will illustrate something with respect to the variety of possible ideas eligible for funding under the "national significance" rubric without appearing, in any way, to be a complete listing—i.e., I would consider it disastrous if, when the call for proposals is issued, most of those received fit into one of these 10 illustrative examples given here. *These 10 are illustrative only.* Second, I have worded these 10 examples purposely in order to illustrate that all of our projects are to be demonstration, not research efforts. This act does not permit OE's office of career education to fund research projects. It does require that all demonstration efforts be evaluated. The basic differences between "research" and "evaluation" must be kept clearly in mind by those submitting proposals.

That portion of this funding purpose calling for projects aimed at "promoting the field of career education," when applied to community college settings, seems to me to be one that would encourage the submission of proposals such as:

1. Demonstrating how successful ideas, practices, and materials generated in various community college settings can best be collated and shared with other community colleges existing in the nation.
2. Demonstrating how career education concepts and methodologies can best be transmitted to and understood by staff members of community colleges.
3. Demonstrating how the career education concept can best be transmitted to and acted upon by governing boards and top administrative leaders in community college settings.
4. Demonstrating how general public support can best be generated and utilized in advancing the cause of career education in community colleges.

The success of such projects should, it seems to me, be judged relatively more on their ability to provide an accurate and adequate basis for decision-making than on whether decisions reached are positive or negative regarding support for career education. That is, I do not regard the primary task here as being one of "selling" career education nearly as much as I do one of "explaining" it. It is the only *professional* way in which these kinds of projects can be operated in my opinion.

Programs Promoting Postsecondary Career Guidance and Counseling

The second purpose specified in section 11 of the act for which demonstration funds can be provided is stated in the law in this way:

- (2) have unusual promise of promoting postsecondary career guidance and counseling programs, particularly postsecondary guidance and counseling programs designed to overcome bias and stereotyping on account of race, sex, age, economic status, or handicap...

This is obviously a much more specific purpose than the first and, consequently, one that will undoubtedly require a relatively smaller number of projects in order to meet. The fact that we are planning for this purpose to be met with considerably less financial effort than the first does not mean that it is of little importance. On the contrary, it is a very important part of the congressional mandate and one that I take most seriously.

As I look at this section of the law, it is obvious that programs to be funded are not to be limited to those aimed at overcoming bias and stereotyping. It is equally obvious that a major share of the effort must be put on projects that meet the criterion of overcoming bias and stereotyping. By the end of the five-year period, it is my current opinion that, in order to meet congressional intent, it will be incumbent on OE's office of career education to make sure that the majority of projects funded under this purpose are ones aimed at overcoming bias and stereotyping in career guidance and counseling programs.

For a project to have, as the Congress has stipulated, "unusual promise" of promoting postsecondary career guidance and counseling programs, it seems apparent to me that such projects must represent something more than what have come to be traditional career guidance and counseling practices in community college settings. What that "something more" is to be will be determined, to a considerable extent, by the ingenuity of those submitting proposals under this purpose of the act. For my part, I am highly hopeful that at least some of these will represent efforts to involve both members of the teaching faculty and persons from the broader community in the career guidance and counseling process. That is, it does not seem to me that an effort aimed only at increasing the number of career guidance and counseling specialists is one that could meet the criterion of "unusual promise" stipulated by the Congress. To simply provide "more of the same" does not, at this point in time, seem to me to be sufficient.

Certainly, at the very least, efforts showing "unusual promise" will surely have to be defined, in part, on the basis of the extent to which they recognize and take into account the various sources of bias and stereotyping that are to be overcome. It does not seem to me, at the present time, that such efforts can properly be limited only to such biases as they are currently seen in professional counselors and in the materials and methods they use. A broader "people emphasis" seems, to me, to be essential.

Projects to Strengthen Career Guidance, Counseling, Placement, and Followup

The third purpose for which demonstration funds may be used under section 11 of the act is stated in the law itself in the following fashion:

(3) show promise of strengthening career guidance, counseling placement, and followup services.

As with the second of the three purposes, this one is much more specific in nature than is the first. As a result, my initial thinking leads me to believe that, in terms of relative financial effort, this purpose will be assigned relatively fewer Federal dollars than will the first. At this point in time, it seems to me that, because of the Congress's use of the word "strengthening" here as opposed to the word "promoting" that was used in stating the second purpose, it may well be that the total amount of Federal funds required here may be greater than those devoted to meeting the second purpose. That is, it would seem more difficult to "strengthen" than to "promote" something. Once again, this is an issue I raise in order to generate reactions, advice, and suggestions.

If career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup services are to be strengthened in postsecondary education institutions, it seems to me, at this point in time, that placement personnel have an especially crucial role to play in the total effort. I say this because of the routine contacts placement specialists already have with the business/labor/industry/professional/government community. It seems eminently obvious to me that, if effectiveness is to

be increased, persons from that community must become involved in the total process. If this is so, then placement specialists will certainly, at least in a logical sense, be key persons involved in helping this to occur.

Simultaneously, it seems equally obvious to me that an essential step in strengthening career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup efforts lies in attempts to bring what are now, on many campuses, segmented efforts together into a single coordinated, systematic effort. At this point in time, my thinking leads me to believe that the congressional call for "strengthening" may well best occur if conscientious attempts are made to strengthen coordination efforts among these four elements, the teaching faculty, and the broader community. A key element will be represented by the extent to which professional and support staff in existing counseling centers place a high priority on the career guidance and counseling process.

It is my hope that demonstration efforts related to this third purpose will be centered relatively more on changing the attitudes, readiness, and ability of a wide variety of kinds of persons to join together in a coordinated effort than on the introduction and utilization of expensive materials and equipment currently being touted for use in career guidance and counseling. This, I admit, is simply a personal bias on my part and one that may well need to be changed. I give it to you here in hopes that, if you feel I am wrong, you will feel free to say so in a forceful and convincing fashion.

Concluding Remarks

In this presentation, I have tried to present some "first blush" thoughts regarding implementation of section 11 of the Career Education Incentive Act. I have been purposely frank and direct in these remarks, not because I am so sure I am right, but rather because I am so sure a great deal of input is needed if wise programmatic decisions are to be made. These remarks are purposely intended to promote reaction. They are, in no way, intended to be a firm statement of the position OE's office of career education will take in administering this section of the act. I can only hope they are received in this, the spirit in which they are intended to be presented.

Even these brief remarks should make it apparent that a very great deal remains to be done in order to demonstrate the need for and effectiveness of career education at the community college level. Inherent in these remarks has, hopefully, been a recognition of the need to refine and re-focus the career education concept in ways that are appropriate for use at the community college level. My current conceptual thoughts on this subject remain substantially as I have stated them in previous papers published on this subject. I find no essential conflict between that position and the general views presented in the special May 1978 issue of the *Community and Junior College Journal*. The need to further sharpen and refine such current conceptual efforts is obvious.

The total amount of money authorized by the Congress for Section 11—"Postsecondary Educational Demonstration Projects"—totals only \$75.0

million dollars over the five-year period of the act. Congressional appropriations are almost certain to be less than this authorized amount. It is not very much money considering the magnitude of the task to be accomplished. To fulfill the intent of the Congress with these limited funds will demand that every project funded hold high positive potential for contributing to one of the three purposes stated in Section 11. The quantity and quality of proposals generated in the community college domain will depend on the interest and expertise of community college personnel. If the rich reservoir of talent currently available among community college specialists is used, in part, in order to accomplish the purposes of this section of the act, I feel confident that the intent of the Congress can and will be met. I hope you will join in this most important task.

References

Career Education Incentive Act. Public Law 95-207, December 13, 1977.

Community and Junior College Journal. Volume 48, No. 8. May 1978.

Hoyt, K. "Career Education in the Community Colleges: An Evolving Concept." Washington, D.C.: Office of Career Education, USOE. April 1977.

Hoyt, K. "Career Education: Challenges for Change in Community Colleges." Washington, D.C.: Office of Career Education, USOE. September 1977.

Strategy Considerations for Implementing the K-12 Portion of the Career Education Incentive Act

It would be both improper and impossible for me to outline specific operational strategies to be used by State Departments of Education and local school districts in implementing the Career Education Incentive Act. Such specific strategies will, and should, vary greatly from State to State and from community to community. The fact that this law makes such variation possible is one of its greatest strengths.

At the same time, some kind of outline of basic general strategies on which specific operational strategies can be based seems very much needed. Such general strategies can be helpful if they are viewed as "food for thought" rather than as a "blueprint for action."

Two concepts differentiate this law from most pieces of Federal legislation. First, use of the word "incentive" in its title makes it clear that funds are to be used to help those State Departments of Education and local school systems who wish to implement career education. The Congress has neither asked nor demanded that career education be implemented. Rather, it has responded to what it perceived to be a grass roots appeal for assistance. This is clearly evident in the small sums of money authorized—and the even smaller sums expected to be appropriated—for this law. With these amounts, "assistance" is possible but "demands" is not.

Second, the "sunset" provisions in this law make it obvious that the Federal incentive effort is intended to be terminated at the end of the 1982-83 school year. The Congress has assumed that Federal assistance during this five-year period will allow States and local school systems to test the career education concept and decide for themselves whether or not to fund it, on a continuing basis, using State and/or local funds. Federal assistance is being made available for "start up" costs, but not for continuing, sustaining efforts.

These two concepts, in my opinion, represent a welcomed challenge. I like very much the principle that sees Federal assistance coming as an outgrowth to local and State calls for help. I like even more the principle of Federal assistance without any implications of Federal dictation or Federal control. If these challenges can be met through this legislation, we may well see emergence of a model that, in the future, will be applied to other parts of education. The strategies formulated for use of these funds have implications far beyond the concept of career education.

The operational strategies to be adopted by State Departments of Education and local school districts will obviously have to be put in the five-year time frame provided by this law. Strategies appropriate for application in any given year will vary considerably, of course, in terms of past activities in career education. Here, I would like to discuss some general strategies, for each of the five years, that hopefully, will illustrate my aspirations with respect to fulfilling the intent of the Congress. I would suspect that the strategies may make more sense to many communities than will the time frame I have used for stating them.

By The End of Year 1

By the end of the 1978-79 school year, it is my hope that a general strategy will have been employed that sees the concept of career education (a) defined with community input (b) in terms consistent with the law (c) in ways that reflect obviously recognized community needs (d) that recognize the need for community participation in implementation and (e) represents a relatively low cost "people effort" rather than carrying any kind of "program add-on" implications.

I see no way any effort, such as career education, can be implemented until it is first defined in terms of what it is, why it is needed, who is to deliver it, and the basic ways in which it is to be carried out. If the community is to be involved in its delivery, then it must also become involved in its definition. If career education is defined by educators and then presented to the community, the community will inevitably feel they are helping the school system with an educational problem. The first strategy question to be considered is whether to consider career education as an education system effort or as a community effort. I am convinced it is wiser, from the outset, to picture it as a community effort.

The law itself defines the parameters around which a career education effort can be constructed. Fortunately, it is written in such a way that many kinds of career education models can be built without breaking the law. Of the common career education models now in existence, only those that call for (a) employing specialists at the building level; (b) concentrating only on secondary school age youth; and/or (c) using an alternative school, as opposed to improving the present school, approach to change are illegal. Most of you will recognize that these restrictions eliminate only the classic EBCE model from those career education models now in common usage.

The concept must be stated in such ways that it clearly concentrates on meeting one real identified community need while, at the same time, holding promise for contributing to, rather than conflicting with, other recognized needs. The career education concept clearly meets this requirement. If, for example, one were to examine the seven basic ways the American public is currently asking American education to change—as reflected in the 10th annual gallup education poll—career education is primarily concerned about one of these ways "more emphasis on careers" while holding direct potential for making contributions to each of the remaining six. While career education cannot afford to adopt a strategy of pretending to be the answer to all of these problems, it must endorse a strategy that stresses its potential for contributing to each without competing with any.

If communities are expected to take over the costs of the effort, then the concept itself must be stated in ways that do not involve substantial increases in the school budget. Similarly, the community cannot be expected to take over any costs, no matter how small, unless the concept demonstrates its worth. The only way a truly effective, low cost effort can be mounted is through a strategy of

"people change" rather than "program add on." This means, operationally, that, when the school board adopts a career education policy, that policy must put basic accountability on all professional educators and provide some kind of rewards system to accompany it.

If these first year strategies work, the end of the first year will see a situation where: (a) career education is understood and accepted by the general community; (b) career education has been endorsed by the school board; and (c) a community career education action council has been formed and charged with responsibility for devising implementation schemes.

By The End Of Year 2

By the end of the 1979-80 school year, it is my hope that: (a) a massive career education infusion effort will have taken place in the K-12 school system; (b) strategies for involving community youth organizations in the career education effort will have been devised and implemented; and (c) initial strategies for involving adult community groups in the career education effort will have been formulated and implemented.

Based on experiences to date, it seems safe to assume many segments of the broader community are now more ready for career education than any professional educators. It would be disastrous to adopt a strategy that calls for bringing the community in closer contact with educators until we are sure that: (a) educators want to interact with them; and (b) educators know why they need them and what they need them for. Specific infusion strategies will have to be devised that recognize the *necessity* of providing educators time to learn how to infuse career education concepts into subject matter, the *importance* of using career education as only one of several motivational devices, and the *essentialness* of providing rewards to those educators most successful in utilizing the career education process. Unless change can be seen coming internally from among educators in the school system, it is doubtful if much change can be expected within the broader community.

A general strategy of recognizing and working actively with community youth organizations involved in career education seems to be highly desirable. Such groups have been engaged in career education—even though they haven't used that term—for a good many years. Several have experienced problems and frustrations in their earlier attempts to work with educators. These include organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts of the USA, Junior Achievement, 4-H, the Nike Clubs of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and many others. If school systems would welcome and work positively with such groups, several advantages would accrue to career education including (a) better quality of delivery of total career education to youth; (b) increased contacts with members of the broader community; and (c) availability of expertise in learning how to best use members of the broader community in the delivery of career education. The

stronger and more effective we help such groups become, the better will be the delivery of career education to youth.

In terms of community efforts, it seems to me crucial that those seeking to implement career education recognize and take advantage of opportunities to enhance this effort through provisions of the current YEDPA legislation. This legislation, in addition to providing clear ways of meeting additional costs associated with providing effective career education to economically disadvantaged youth, holds high potential for use in secondary school career education implementation efforts through its "transition services" provisions. If a strategy is adopted that seeks to merge the career education and the YEDPA efforts, both will better meet their individual goals. Further, more career education funds will then be available for use at the K-6 levels.

A number of adult community organizations exist holding high potential for participating in the effective delivery of career education. Those whose goals are compatible with those of the education system should, in terms of general strategy, be sought out. It would seem wiser strategy to use existing community organizations than to approach something as nebulous as "the community" as a whole. To adopt such a general strategy has several advantages including: (a) getting community leaders involved in career education; (b) developing communication channels for reaching various segments of the community; and (c) organizing community resources in ways that are both efficient and effective. This general strategy is one that depends on recognition, at the local level, of persons in each organization who have the interest and ability to "make career education happen." Such community organizations include, for example, the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, local central AFL/CIO Labor Council, American Legion/Legion Auxiliary, Business and Professional Women's Club, Women's American ORT, National Urban League, Local Council of Churches, Local Chapters of the American Association of Retired Persons, and many others. The general strategy should be one of enlisting their participation in career education in ways that also enhance the goals of each community organization. It is not, and cannot be, a one way street.

If these second year strategies work, we should see a situation where: (a) the school system should be ready for a comprehensive community career education effort; (b) existing community youth organizations already delivering career education are strengthened through help given them by the education system; and (c) an organizational structure and communication system has been established with existing adult community organizations that will make the delivery of career education proceed in an orderly and systematic fashion.

By The End Of Year 3

By the end of the 1980-81 school year, it is my hope that a concerted nationwide attempt will have been made to implement a comprehensive career education effort with a high degree of cooperation existing between the education system and a key nucleus of community organizations. If comprehensive

efforts can be assured, it is my further hope that high priority will be given to careful evaluations of career education's effectiveness.

Just as comprehension logically precedes communication, so, too, does cooperation logically precede collaboration. People have to learn to work together, to trust each other, and to help each other before they can comfortably share in the "ownership" of a concept such as career education. It would seem to be a wise general strategy to allow collaboration to evolve out of comprehensive cooperative efforts.

By the beginning of the 1980-81 school year, those communities—including those school districts—who are ready to begin comprehensive career education efforts should be apparent. One way of distinguishing such communities from those who are not will be to see which communities are willing to start using their own funds to pay 25 percent of the costs associated with career education. A second way will be to assess the proportion of professional educators in the community who appear to understand and be enthusiastic about career education. A third way will be to assess expressions of interest and willingness to participate on the part of community organizations. I would definitely opt for a general strategy in this, the third year of the act, that calls for concentrating Federal funds on those communities who appear ready to implement comprehensive career education efforts.

As a general strategy, I would further urge that the comprehensiveness of evaluation efforts be related to the comprehensiveness of the implementation effort. Superficial implementation efforts deserve no more than superficial evaluations. Comprehensive implementation efforts demand comprehensive evaluations. As a general rule, I would hope that evaluation efforts utilize criteria meaningful to the general community stated in terms directly related to the prime goals of career education and measured in such a fashion that proper credit—or lack of credit—can be given to participating community organizations as well as to the education system.

Even at this relatively early stage, it does not seem unreasonable to consider a strategy that calls for identifying at least one school system in each State whose career education efforts produce evaluative data that could be submitted to USOE's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) for approval and subsequent insertion into the National Diffusion Network (NDN). This is an important strategy for two basic reasons: (a) it will result in wide national publicity for career education efforts that have proven themselves to be effective; and (b) other school systems can, in later years, use ESEA funds for adopting models of career education in the NDN network long after the brief five-year life of this act has ended.

If evaluation results are shared with all cooperating elements and with the general public, the groundwork will have been laid for moving from a cooperative to a collaborative career education effort.

By The End Of Year 4

By the end of the 1981-82 school year, I would hope that beginning collaborative career education efforts could be mounted in many communities. By this time, of course, Federal funds can only pay up to 50 percent of the costs for implementing career education with the other 50 percent coming from State and/or local funds. If responsibility for the effectiveness of career education is to be shared between the education system and the broader community, so must its "ownership" be shared. The school system must be willing to give away part of the ownership and the broader community must be willing to accept it. It is unreasonable to expect that the process will be completed in many communities by the end of the 1981-82 school year, but it is essential that it originates.

There are three basic reasons why I suggest this general strategy. First, it seems reasonable to expect that results of the first comprehensive evaluation efforts will make clear many needs for improvement. Such improvements are sure to demand both the expertise and the resources of the broader community in addition to those available within the education system. Second, if the broader community becomes involved in making directional decisions and providing some financial support to the career education effort, it seems likely it will become even more supportive of the total effort. Third, without continuing community pressure, it is, in my opinion, unrealistic to think that the education system will continue the career education effort on a long-term basis. Too many other new things will have come along.

If "ownership" of career education is truly begun to be shared with the broader community, I am confident that the evaluation results by the end of the fourth year will be even more impressive than those collected earlier. Many more career education efforts should find their way into the NDN Network which, in combination, will represent a wide variety of ways in which career education can be successfully implemented. It seems to me the fourth year would be an appropriate one to encourage a widespread JDRP/NDN effort.

By The End Of Year 5

By the end of the 1982-83 school year, it seems wise to me to adopt a general strategy that calls for Federal funds to be used only in those communities where a true community collaborative career education effort is in place. By that time, 75 percent of the operating costs will be borne by States and/or local communities. The Federal Government will be out of the picture in terms of providing direct financial assistance by the end of the 1982-83 school year. That part of the intent of the Congress will have been met.

Crucial strategy questions will have to be solved in each State regarding the extent to which the career education effort should be funded primarily with local funds, primarily with State funds, or with some combination of State and local funds. The correct strategy to be applied will differ considerably from

State to State. In those States where State funds are sought, an essential part of the strategy required will be in the form of grass roots appeals from participating community organizations to their State counterparts for purpose of influencing State legislation. In other States, I would anticipate finding no need for such action.

By the end of the fifth year, it must be remembered that there will have been five years of concentrated demonstration efforts for career education at the postsecondary education levels—including the area of adult education. A continuing community career education effort must, it seems to me, recognize the importance of extending that effort to include students in postsecondary educational institutions and adults as well as the K-12 student population. There is no way, in my opinion, that those planning long range strategies for career education can limit themselves to only the K-12 school system.

The costs of career education in this fifth year and beyond should be limited to maintenance costs rather than the more expensive start up costs of earlier years. These will include costs associated with community coordinating efforts, communication efforts, evaluative efforts, continuing inservice efforts for both educators and community personnel, and some costs associated with career education materials. While these sustaining maintenance costs will not be large, neither will they be nonexistent. By the end of the fifth year, they should be well-known and plans made to provide for them that involve financial contributions from both the education system and the broader community.

Concluding Remarks

The broad, general strategies I have discussed here can be summarized in a very few basic points including the following:

Strategy 1: Don't rush into full scale implementation efforts until we have had time to regroup, to correct our earlier conceptual errors made in the beginning days of career education, and to present a modern up-to-date concept that pictures career education as a total community effort aimed at preparing persons for work in ways that extend beyond providing them with specific entry level job skills. We must, if we are to implement career education, begin with a clear understanding of what it is and how we propose to implement it.

Strategy 2: Make sure that there exists an internal readiness and expertise within professional educators for implementing career education before seeking broader community involvement on an intensive basis. An accountability and rewards system must be built into this internal readiness phase.

Strategy 3: In seeking involvement of the broader community, use existing community groups as a basis rather than a "shot gun" approach to the entire community. In doing so, plan strategies in such a way that each community group is a beneficiary as well as a contributor to career education. This is essential to a sustaining community effort.

Strategy 4: Cooperation precedes collaboration. We cannot hope to enter into a collaborative effort until we are first successful in establishing effective cooperative working relationships with the community.

Strategy 5: As we move toward collaboration, we must do so by sharing ownership of career education with the broader community. This means returning to the general community some of the responsibilities which, in earlier years, had turned over to the education system to do alone.

Strategy 6: Devote relatively greater efforts to making sure career education works where it is implemented than in making beginning implementation efforts in every school district. If we follow this strategy, we will be building opportunities for other school districts to initiate career education efforts later using funds other than those available under this act.

These six general strategies, along with the several smaller sub-strategies presented in this paper, are ones that, in my opinion, will help us deliver the most effective career education effort while following the congressional mandate for only a five-year period in which to make this next big breakthrough in the career education "crusade." Career education started with a rush in 1971 and has continued to appeal to the general public ever since. After a very rapid beginning—including the making of many conceptual and operational errors—it has, in the last three years, been operating on a plateau where interest in career education has exceeded, by a very wide margin, opportunities for its implementation. In enacting the Career Education Incentive Act, the Congress has provided us with a much needed and timely opportunity to make another big surge forward. It is an opportunity that must not be missed.

There are many, I'm sure, who believe career education has run its course and is now on the way out as just "another passing fad." In my opinion, we are, with the help of this legislation, really just beginning. With the Federal assistance provided under this act coupled with the enthusiasm and expertise of those many career education advocates who, through all of our difficulties and disappointments, have refused to give up, I contend that we are now about to really make career education a reality in America. It is time we do so.